the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CAMP:

H. R. 6177. A bill to amend section 3801 of the Internal Revenue Code with respect to mitigation of statute of limitations; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CELLER:

H. R. 6178. A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit and district judges, and for other purposes; to the Committtee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DENTON:

H. R. 6179. A bill amending Public Law 49, Seventy-seventh Congress, providing for the welfare of coal miners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. DONDERO:

H. R. 6180. A bill to amend and supplement the Federal-Aid Road Act approved July 11, 1916 (39 Stat. 355), as amended and supplemented, to authorize appropriations for continuing the construction of highways, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 6181. A bill to provide supplementary unemployment compensation benefits in certain cases to workers unemployed during the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ELLIOTT:

H. R. 6182. A bill to amend certain provisions of the National Service Life Insurance Act of 1940, as amended, to assure the right to judicial review; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6183. A bill to extend pension benefits under the laws reenacted by Public Law 269, Seventy-fourth Congress, August 13, 1935, as now or hereafter amended, to certain persons who served with the United States military or naval forces engaged in hostilities in the Moro Province, including Mindanao, or in the islands of Samar and Leyte, after July 4, 1902, and prior to January 1, 1914, and to their unremarried widows, child, or children; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

H. R. 6184. A bill to amend the Federal Trade Commission Act with respect to certain contracts and agreements which establish minimum resale prices and which are extended by State law to nonsigners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H. R. 6185. A bill to amend the Public Health Service Act to provide a program of grants and scholarships for education in the field of nursing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HARRIS:

H. R. 6186. A bill to designate the lake created by Narrows Dam in the State of Arkansas as Lake Greeson in honor of the late Martin W. Greeson; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. HOWELL:

H. R. 6187. A bill to broaden the cooperative extension system as established in the act of May 8, 1914, and acts supplemental thereto, by providing for cooperative extension work between colleges receiving the benefits of this act and the acts of July 2, 1862, and August 30, 1890, and other qualified colleges, universities, and research agencies, and the United States Department of Labor; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 6188. A bill to provide supplementary unemployment compensation benefits in certain cases to workers unemployed during the national emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SMITH of Mississippi:

H. R. 6189. A bill to amend section 7 of the Natural Gas Act, with respect to extensions of service; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 6190. A bill to establish an independent Federal Education Agency in the Federal Government and to define its organization, power, and duties; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. CASE:

H. Con. Res. 187. Concurrent resolution calling for investigation of Newark Airport and the tragic crash in Elizabeth, N. J.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. Con. Res. 188. Concurrent resolution calling for investigation of Newark Airport and the tragic crash in Elizabeth, N. J.; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CASE:

H. Res. 500. Resolution for the investigation of the Newark, N. J., Airport; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. CLEMENTE:

H. Res. 501. Resolution to investigate airplane disasters; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. HESELTON:

H. Res. 502. Resolution to inquire into the adequacy of fuel supplies in New England; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. KEAN:

H. Res. 503. Resolution for the investigation of the Newark, N. J., Airport; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WOLVERTON:

H. Res. 504. Resolution authorizing and directing the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to investigate miscellaneous problems of air safety, including airports in congested areas and instrument landings; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H. R. 6191. A bill to overcome an excludable ground of admission into the United States other than race for Francesca Pesa Russoniello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BYRNE of New York:

H. R. 6192. A bill for the relief of certain displaced persons; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. D'EWART:

H. R. 6193. A bill authorizing the issuance of a patent in fee to Lincoln White Shirt; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. HELLER:

H. R. 6194. A bill for the relief of Dr. Reuben Rapaport; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 6195. A bill for the relief of Jose Almeida Novo; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGUIRE:

H. R. 6196. A bill for the relief of Honora Waldron and Bridget Waldron; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MACHROWICZ:

H. R. 6197. A bill for the relief of Jacqueline Touma Rahal; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MADDEN:

H. R. 6198. A bill for the relief of Kyrriakos Tsambis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 6199. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Kotsojianis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. RIVERS:

H. R. 6200. A bill for the relief of William H. Lubkin, Jr.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHAFER:

H. R. 6201. A bill for the relief of Hans V. Diernisse; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

H. R. 6202. A bill for the relief of Paul Joseph Splingaerd, Helene Colette Splingaerd, and Renee Anne Splingaerd; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. VINSON:

H. R. 6203. A bill to authorize the retirement of Capt. Joy Bright Hancock, United States Navy; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. YORTY:

H. R. 6204. A bill for the racially ineligible fiancée of a United States citizen veteran of World War II; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

513. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Queensboro Federation of Mothers Clubs, Forest Hills, N. Y., relative to urging support of the antismuggling bill, H. R. 4544; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

514. Also, petition of Long Island Federation of Women's Clubs, Inc., Baldwin, N. Y., relative to urging support of the antismuggling bill, H. R. 4544; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 1952

(Legislative day of Thursday, January 10, 1952)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God our Father, Thy love alone is the flame by which we kindle the altar fires of our conquering hopes. Make us ever mindful that upon the free soil of this continent our fathers toiled to rear a house of faith hallowed by Thy name. May we know no glory but the supreme satisfaction of rendering to the Nation and to the world our utmost service, unsullied by base motives of self-interest, as again with the golden gift of a new day at this white altar of devotion we pledge integrity of character, clean hands, and unswerving firmness of purpose in the fulfillment of the high and holy cause as servants of the Republic, and of this torn and tortured world. We ask it in the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. McFARLAND, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, January 23, 1952, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting

nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House had agreed to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4687) to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled bill (H. R. 4687) to provide for the withholding of certain patents that might be detrimental to the national security, and for other purposes, and it was signed by the Vice President.

MEETING OF SUBCOMMITTEE DURING SESSION OF THE SENATE

Mr. NEELY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the subcommittee of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare which is conducting hearings on Senate bill 1310, the mine safety bill, may sit this afternoon while the Senate is in session, and on each successive day the Senate is in session until the business of the subcommittee shall have been completed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. Under a special order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, the Chair is authorized to appoint a Senator to read Washington's Farewell Address on the 22d day of February. In making the appointment the Chair always alternates between the two sides of the aisle. At this time the appointment falls to a Member of the majority. The Chair takes great pleasure in appointing the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. PASTORE] to perform the function on February 22.

CHICAGO INTERNATIONAL TRADE FAIR AT CHICAGO, ILL.—REQUEST FOR RETURN OF HOUSE JOINT RESOLUTION 331

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate House Concurrent Resolution 186, which was read as follows:

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the United States is hereby requested to return to the House of Representatives the enrolled joint resolution, House Joint Resolution 331, authorizing the President to invite the States of the Union and foreign countries to participate in the Chicago International Trade Fair, to be held in Chicago, Ill., March 22 to April 6, 1952, and that, when such joint resolution is returned by the President, the action of the Speaker of the House of Representatives and of the President of the Senate in signing such joint resolution is hereby rescinded.

Mr. McFARLAND. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the concurrent resolution.

The motion was agreed to, and the concurrent resolution was considered and agreed to.

TRANSACTION OF ROUTINE BUSINESS

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that Senators be permitted to present petitions and memorials, introduce bills and joint resolutions, and submit routine matters for the RECORD, without debate and without speeches.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

STATEMENT OF RECEIPTS AND EXPENDITURES BY CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a statement of receipts and expenditures of the company for the year 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

COMPARATIVE GENERAL BALANCE SHEET OF CHESAPEAKE & POTOMAC TELEPHONE CO.

A letter from the vice president and comptroller of the Chesapeake & Potomac Telephone Co., Washington, D. C., transmitting, pursuant to law, a comparative general balance sheet of the company for the year 1951 (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. HOEY, from the Committee on Finance:

S. Res. 253. Resolution requesting the Tariff Commission to make an investigation of cost of production of china and other products; without amendment (Rept. No. 1109).

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

H. R. 1012. A bill to permit educational, religious, or charitable institutions to import textile machines and parts thereof for instructional purposes; with an amendment (Rept. No. 1110).

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. Res. 263. Resolution authorizing expenditures for hearings and investigations by the Committee on Armed Services; without amendment; and, under the rule, referred to Committee on Rules and Administration.

EXTENSION OF TIME FOR INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN TRANSPORTATION PROBLEMS BY COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 258), reported by Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on January 21, 1952, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the time within which the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce may complete the investigation authorized by Senate Resolution 50, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to April 11, 1949, as continued by Senate Resolution 308, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 27, 1950, Senate Resolution 55, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to February 19, 1951, and Senate Resolution 154, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to June 29, 1951, hereby is extended to January 31, 1953.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 252), reported by Mr. McCLELLAN from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on January 16, 1952, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (C) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1952, and ending on January 31, 1953, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed the unexpended balance of the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 54, Eighty-second Congress, first session, agreed to on February 1, 1951, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

ADDITIONAL CLERK FOR MAJORITY AND MINORITY LEADERS

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 240), submitted by Mr. BRIDGES on January 10, 1952, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in addition to any other clerical assistance to which each may be entitled, the majority leader and the minority leader of the Senate shall each be entitled to a clerk to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate at a basic rate of $2,520.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 261), reported by Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary on January 21, 1952, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (k) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on the Judiciary, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1952, and ending on January 31, 1953, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon

a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

ADDITIONAL EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 260), reported by Mr. McCARRAN from the Committee on the Judiciary on January 21, 1952, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary hereby is authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, during the Eighty-second Congress, $10,000 in addition to the amount, and for the same purposes, specified in section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act approved August 2, 1946.

ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL AND INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON EXPENDITURES IN THE EXECUTIVE DEPARTMENTS

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 251), reported by Mr. McCLELLAN, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments on January 16, 1952, reported it favorably, with an amendment, on page 1, line 7, after the word "on", where it occurs the second time, to strike out "February 15" and insert "January 31."

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection (g) (2) (B) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate, or any other duties imposed upon it, the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period beginning on February 1, 1952, and ending on January 31, 1953, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, and such technical, clerical, and other assistants, as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $89,000 in addition to the amount authorized under Senate Resolution 156, Eighty-second Congress, first session, agreed to June 14, 1951, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee or subcommittee, as the case may be.

INCREASED LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON RULES AND ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 262), submitted by Mr. GILLETTE on January 22, 1952, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the limit of expenditures authorized under Senate Resolution 209, Eighty-second Congress, first session, agreed to September 13, 1951 (authorizing the expenditure of funds and the employment of assistants by the Committee on Rules and Administration, or any authorized subcommittee thereof, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by subsection (o) (1) (D) of rule XXV of the Standing Rules of the Senate), is hereby increased by $75,000.

INVESTIGATION OF PROBLEMS RELATING TO ECONOMIC MOBILIZATION AND STABILIZATION, ETC.

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 248), reported by Mr. MAYBANK, from the Committee on Banking and Currency, on January 15, 1952, reported it favorably, with amendments, on page 1, line 4, after the word "to", where it occurs the first time, to strike out "February 15," and insert "January 31,", and on page 2, line 4, after the word "until", to strike out "February 15," and insert "January 31".

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Banking and Currency, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed during the period from February 1, 1952, to January 31, 1953, to make a full and complete study and investigation of such problems as it may deem proper relating to (1) economic mobilization and stabilization; (2) domestic and international banking policies, including Federal Reserve matters and deposit insurance; (3) construction of housing and community facilities in the present national emergency; (4) Federal loan policies; and (5) war-disaster insurance.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the sessions, recesses, and adjourned periods of the Eighty-second Congress and the Eighty-third Congress, until January 31, 1953, (1) to make such expenditures as it deems advisable; (2) to employ upon a temporary basis such technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable; and (3) with the consent of the head of the department or agency concerned, to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of any of the departments or agencies of the Government.

SEC. 3. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to expend not to exceed $28,000 in addition to any other unobligated balance of funds made available pursuant to Senate Resolution 64, Eighty-second Congress, first session, agreed to on February 19, 1951.

SEC. 4. Expenses of the committee under this resolution shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXPENDITURES FOR SENATE COMMITTEE PERSONNEL

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, I hope that Members of the Senate will seriously consider the import of all the resolutions which are being brought up calling for increased personnel and increased expenditures on the part of the Congress. I know the purpose is good, namely, to enable Congress to keep up with the activities of the Government agencies in Washington, and see that they comply with the directions of Congress, but I am wondering where the end will be. I am apprehensive that we are rapidly getting ourselves into the same position occupied by the agencies of the executive branch of the Government which we are prone to criticize. Many of our committees will have to have tremendous staffs if we are to keep up with these agencies in all respects.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. AIKEN. I am not objecting to the resolutions which are being presented today. I merely desire to call the attention of the Senate at this time to the fact that we can go too far. I am sure there are some committees of the Congress which are overstaffed. I am sure there are members of the staffs of some committees who are overpaid. I know that is creating a good deal of dissatisfaction and discontent in our own senatorial offices when the employees read of the large salaries which are paid so many who work for the committees.

While I am not objecting today to the resolutions now being reported, I do hope Senators will consider this matter, and realize that it is impossible for us to go far enough to keep up with everything done by the executive agencies unless we are willing to have very much larger staffs.

I now yield to the Senator from Arizona.

Mr. HAYDEN. There are no increases in the case of any of the committees over the amounts which were allowed to them last year. The Senator from Vermont intimated that the amounts were being increased. The only really new investigation is one by the committee of which the Senator is a member, namely, the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry. I am about to report a resolution in that connection.

Mr. AIKEN. That is correct. That is a very temporary investigation, I hope.

On the question of increases, I understood that there was a substantial increase in the appropriations for the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. HAYDEN. No.

Mr. AIKEN. One was requested, was it not?

Mr. HAYDEN. An increase was requested, but the only increase allowed was for the purpose of enabling the committee to retain its existing personnel by providing sufficient money to pay the 10-percent increase in salaries which was provided by law. No personnel have been added.

Mr. AIKEN. If no increase was allowed, let me congratulate the Committee on Rules and Administration and its chairman, because I think that committee had all it needed. It has more personnel now than it needs.

Mr. HAYDEN. The committee was allowed $125,000 last year under a resolution. This year we allowed it sufficient to pay the 10-percent increase in salaries above the $125,000, and that is all.

Mr. AIKEN. I was referring not so much to the regular staffs as to the large special staffs for some committees.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. AIKEN. I am glad that the Committee on Rules and Administration has decided that there must be a stopping point somewhere.

INVESTIGATION OF CERTAIN ACTIVITIES OF COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION AND ALLEGED DEALINGS IN GAS AND OIL INTERESTS BY EMPLOYEES OF FARM CREDIT ADMINISTRATION

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 256), reported by Mr. ELLENDER from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry on January 21, 1952, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of—

(1) all Commodity Credit Corporation activities relating to storage and processing, including particularly, but not to the exclusion of others, (a) the matters described in Preliminary Report of Investigation, Alleged Irregularities in Connection with Warehousing Facilities, Grain Branch, Production and Marketing Administration, Department of Agriculture, Dallas, Tex., and (b) the storage of commodities by Commodity Credit Corporation at Camp Crowder, Mo.; and

(2) all alleged dealings in oil and gas interests by employees of the Farm Credit Administration.

The committee shall report its findings together with its recommendations for such legislation as it may deem advisable to the Senate not later than June 30, 1952.

SEC. 2. For the purposes of this resolution, the committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to employ upon a temporary basis such legal, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable. The expenses of the Committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $50,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

ADDITIONAL TEMPORARY PERSONNEL AND INCREASE IN EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 244), submitted by Mr. MURRAY on January 10, 1952, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and reported by that Committee with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$249,999" and insert "$176,012", reported it with an additional amendment.

The amendment of the Committee on Rules and Administration was, on page 2, line 1, after the word "exceed", to strike out "$176,012", as proposed to be amended, and insert "$139,000."

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That in holding hearings, reporting such hearings, and making investigations as authorized by subsection 1 (1) of rule XXV of the standing Rules of the Senate, or by sections 134 (a) and 136 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period from February 1, 1952, through January 31, 1953, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such professional, administrative, and clerical personnel as it deems advisable.

SEC. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed $139,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXTENSION OF EMPLOYMENT OF ADDITIONAL PERSONNEL FOR COMMITTEE ON LABOR AND PUBLIC WELFARE

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 243), submitted by Mr. MURRAY on January 10, 1952, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and reported by that Committee with an amendment, in line 4, after the numerals "1950", to insert "as extended by S. Res. 309, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 17, 1950, and as further extended by S. Res. 143, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to September 27, 1951", reported it without additional amendment.

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendment of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare was agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under Senate Resolution 215, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to February 9, 1950, as extended by Senate Resolution 309, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 17, 1950, and as further extended by Senate Resolution 143, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to September 27, 1951, authorizing the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare to employ one additional staff member and one additional clerical assistant, is hereby continued until January 31, 1953.

BESSIE BOYD DANIEL

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 254), submitted by Mr. MAYBANK on January 17, 1952, reported it favorably, without amendment, and it was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate hereby is authorized and directed to pay from the contingent fund of the Senate to Bessie Boyd Daniel, widow of Thomas H. Daniel, late an employee of the Senate, a sum equal to 6 months' compensation at the rate he was receiving by law at the time of his death, said sum to be considered inclusive of funeral expenses and all other allowances.

FUNDS APPROPRIATED FOR COMMITTEES

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, I think the Committee on Rules and Administration and its distinguished chairman have done a good job in connection with recommendations for appropriations for the activities of various committees, as the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has pointed out. However, I believe that the committees for which funds have been appropriated should now live within the amount given them, for the remainder of the session or the fiscal year, whichever the authorization is for, and that we should not be called upon again to start making supplementary appropriations.

The committees know what amounts are available to them. The Committee on Rules and Administration considered the various requests very carefully. The chairman has presented the recommendations of the Rules Committee. From now on, having those funds appropriated, the committees ought to proceed to live within them, and not come back time after time to the Committee on Rules and Administration, and subsequently to the Senate, for further funds. I hope the Senate will recognize the desirability of the committees living within their appropriations, and that the committees will be forced to live within their appropriations and authorizations.

I should like to have it understood that my remarks are not directed toward the activities of any specific committee or subcommittee, but have reference to the activities of all Senate committees.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, speaking as a member of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished minority leader. I think the committees should, from now on, live within the appropriations granted by the Senate.

EXTENSION OF TIME AND ADDITIONAL APPROPRIATION FOR INVESTIGATION OF CRIME IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, to which was referred the resolution (S. Res. 264), reported by Mr. NEELY from the Committee on the District of Columbia on January 22, 1952, reported it favorably, with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "of", to strike out "$61,200" and insert "$15,000"; in line 8, after the word "purposes", to strike out the period and insert "and the date for filing its report to the Senate is hereby extended from January 31, 1952, to February 29, 1952.", and after line 8, to strike out:

SEC. 2. Subsection (2) of section 1 of Senate Resolution 136, is amended to read as follows:

"(2) to make an interim report to the Senate on or before January 31, 1952, and a final report to the Senate on or before June 30, 1952, with respect to the results of its study and investigation with respect to crime and related problems, including law enforcement, in the District of Columbia, and to make recommendations for necessary legislation. The authority conferred by Senate Resolution 136, Eighty-second Congress, shall terminate on June 30, 1952."

The Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

The amendments were agreed to.

The resolution, as amended, was agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on the District of Columbia, or the duly authorized subcommittee thereof, investigating crime and

law enforcement, under authority of Senate Resolution 136, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to September 13, 1951, is hereby authorized to expend from the contingent fund of the Senate, to carry out the purposes of Senate Resolution 136, the sum of $15,000, in addition to the amount heretofore authorized for the same purposes and the date for filing its report to the Senate is hereby extended from January 31, 1952, to February 29, 1952.

PRINTING OF REPORT OF THIRTY-FIFTH ANNUAL CONVENTION OF AMERICAN INSTRUCTORS OF THE DEAF (S. DOC. NO. 99)

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Rules and Administration, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 265), which was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the report of the proceedings of the thirty-fifth meeting of the Convention of American Instructors of the Deaf, held in Fulton, Mo., June 18 to 22, 1951, be printed, with illustrations, as a Senate document.

REPORT ON PERSONNEL AND FUNDS BY SUBCOMMITTEE ON PREPAREDNESS, COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, the following report was received by the Secretary of the Senate:

JANUARY 2, 1952.

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

PREPAREDNESS SUBCOMMITTEE

To the SECRETARY OF THE SENATE:

The above-mentioned committee, pursuant to Senate Resolution 123, Eightieth Congress, first session, submits the following report showing the name, profession, and total salary of each person employed by it and its subcommittees for the period from July 1, 1951, to December 31, 1951, together with the funds available to and expended by it and its subcommittees:

Name and profession	Rate of gross annual salary	Total salary received
Bartosh, Ena G., stenographer	$3,900.68	$1,878.62
Burns, Hazel L., stenographer (from Aug. 6)	3,327.12	1,340.07
DeSimone, Evelyn B.,[1] stenographer (to July 27)	3,546.08	295.50
Devlin, Harold M., accountant	9,321.88	4,660.92
Dewey, Fred A.,[1] attorney (to Sept. 21)	8,521.88	2,176.20
Engle, Wallace L., investigator	4,761.00	2,380.50
Freed, Daniel J., attorney (from July 16)	4,187.45	1,919.23
Gilman, George T., investigator	6,672.85	3,224.89
Ginsburg, David, assistant counsel	9,653.69	4,826.82
Horner, Arthur D., investigator	7,150.81	3,575.40
Keadle, Mary Frances, stenographer	3,900.68	1,902.50
Kaplan, Joan F., research assistant (from July 23)	5,334.57	2,341.24
McGillicuddy, Daniel F., Jr., attorney	7,150.81	3,575.40
Martin, George H., staff consultant (from Oct. 3)	8,005.36	1,956.85
Melchior, Kurt W., attorney	4,187.45	2,093.70
Miller, Mary M., clerk-typist (from Aug. 20)	3,613.89	1,315.03
Mullins, Joseph F., Jr.,[1] clerk-messenger (to Sept. 14)	2,450.19	503.79
Nichols, Dorothy J., assistant administrative clerk	5,430.16	2,715.06
Phillips, Martha J.,[1] stenographer (to July 15)	3,632.97	151.37
Popple, Paul M.,[1] investigator (to Oct. 3)	7,150.81	1,986.30
Reedy, George E., Jr., staff consultant	$9,819.59	$4,909.74
Rice, Downey, special counsel (from Sept. 27)	11,646.00	3,044.06
Shelton, Edgar G., Jr.,[1] editorial assistant to chairman (to Sept. 17)	7,150.81	1,498.75
Taylor, Willie Day, stenographer (from Oct. 1)	4,187.45	1,045.85
Tyler, Lyon L., Jr., assistant chief counsel	11,646.00	5,615.25
Walsted, B. Gladys,[1] stenographer (to Sept. 17)	4,187.45	898.81
Wildenthal, John, Jr., attorney	4,187.45	2,045.91
Sherfy, Lawrence P., attorney (Department of Justice reimbursed for salary, June 10 to Dec. 8, 1951)	9,800.00	4,838.41

[1] No longer with the Preparedness Subcommittee.

Funds authorized or appropriated for committee expenditure under S. Res. 18	$190,000.00
Amount expended, Feb. 1 to June 30, 1951	43,695.72
Balance unexpended, June 30, 1951	146,304.28
Amount expended, July 1 to Dec. 31, 1951	76,626.97
Balance unexpended, Dec. 31, 1951	69,677.31

LYNDON B. JOHNSON,
Chairman, Preparedness Subcommittee.
RICHARD B. RUSSELL,
Chairman, Committee on Armed Services.

BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. MARTIN:

S. 2508. A bill for the relief of Lydia L. A. Samraney;

S. 2509. A bill for the relief of Barbara Jean Light;

S. 2510. A bill for the relief of Shizue Tsutsumi; and

S. 2511. A bill for the relief of Setsuko Takeda; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska:

S. 2512. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Maria Nucaro Scalise; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WELKER:

S. 2513. A bill for the relief of Mo-Kwong Wong; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREEN:

S. 2514. A bill to provide for the rehabilitation of the interisland commerce of the Republic of the Philippines by authorizing the Department of Commerce to sell certain vessels to citizens of the Republic of the Philippines, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S. 2515. A bill for the relief of Walter R. Binai; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S. 2516. A bill for the relief of John C. K. Yu; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAYBANK (for himself and Mr. FREAR):

S. 2517. A bill to amend section 5 of the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. BRICKER (for himself, Mr. CAPEHART, and Mr. O'CONOR):

S. 2518. A bill to amend the Interstate Commerce Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONOR (for himself, Mr. MAGNUSON, Mr. BRICKER, and Mr. CAPEHART):

S. 2519. A bill to amend section 15a of the Interstate Commerce Act, as amended; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

FUNDS FOR STUDY OF RAILROAD RETIREMENT ACT AND RELATED PROBLEMS

Mr. DOUGLAS submitted the following concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 56), which was referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That for the purposes of Senate Concurrent Resolution 51, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to October 17, 1951 (establishing a joint congressional committee to make a full and complete study of the Railroad Retirement Act, and of such related problems as it may deem proper) the joint committee or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to expend not to exceed $50,000, and such expenses shall be paid one-half from the contingent fund of the Senate and one-half from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives upon vouchers signed by the chairman. Disbursements to pay such expenses shall be made by the Secretary of the Senate out of the contingent fund of the Senate, such contingent fund to be reimbursed from the contingent fund of the House of Representatives in the amount of one-half of the disbursements so made.

REPEAL OF EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES—AMENDMENT

Mr. CASE submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF IMMUNITY PROVISION RELATING TO TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES BEFORE CONGRESS OR COMMITTEES—AMENDMENT

Mr. McCARRAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 1570) to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees, which was ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

AMENDMENT OF PUBLIC LAW 351, EIGHTY-FIRST CONGRESS—AMENDMENT

Mr. SPARKMAN submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 5715) to amend sections 201 (a), 301 (e), 302 (g), 508, 527, and 528 of Public Law 351, Eighty-first Congress, as amended, which was referred to the Committee on Armed Services and ordered to be printed.

PRINTING OF SUMMARY OF FEDERAL AND STATE LAWS REGULATING THE NOMINATION AND ELECTION OF UNITED STATES SENATORS (S. DOC. NO. 97)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a summary of Federal and State laws regulating the nomination and election of United States Senators.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

PRINTING OF REPORT BY AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH COMMITTEE ON SOIL AND WATER PROBLEMS AND RESEARCH NEEDS OF THE WEST (S. DOC. NO. 98)

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, by direction of the Committee on Rules and Administration, I ask unanimous consent to have printed as a Senate document a report by the Agricultural Research Committee on soil and water problems and research needs of the West.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Arizona? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE APPENDIX

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the Appendix, as follows:

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

Address delivered by him at the Republican National Committee luncheon at San Francisco, Calif., January 19, 1952.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Address delivered by Senator JENNER on January 19, 1952, on the occasion of the production of the one millionth refrigerator by the International Harvester Plant at Evansville, Ind.

By Mr. MUNDT:

Article entitled "What Is a Communist?" written by him and published in the National Republic for December 1951.

By Mr. WILEY:

A statement prepared by him and certain published articles with regard to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence seaway project.

By Mr. SCHOEPPEL:

Address on the subject flood problems in Kansas, delivered by Elmer T. Peterson on December 6, 1951, in Oklahoma City, Okla., before the Kansas Watershed Association.

By Mr. BRIDGES:

Article entitled "Two Hundred and Thirty-nine Million Dollars New Hampshire Share of United States Budget," published in the Manchester (N. H.) Union Leader of January 22, 1952.

By Mr. BRICKER:

State Department memoranda on establishment and organization of the United States International Information Administration.

By Mr. HOEY:

Editorial entitled "Arthur T. Abernethy, Poet Laureate," published in a recent issue of the Hickory (N. C.) Daily Record.

By Mr. WELKER:

Article by James P. Gossett, of Gooding County, Idaho, on the subject of public power versus private power.

By Mr. O'CONOR:

An article entitled "Unbiased Study and Constructive Action Needed," reprinted from Fleet Owner in the issue for October 1951.

GOVERNMENT BY TREATY—ADDRESS BY WILLIAM H. FITZPATRICK

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an address entitled "An Editor Looks at Some Law—Government by Treaty," delivered by William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the New Orleans States, before the fifty-second annual meeting of the Nebraska State Bar Association at Omaha, Nebr., on November 14, 1951. It covers a subject which is alive on our calendar at this time, because it refers to a treaty which is before the Committee on Foreign Relations at this moment. That is the reason I ask that it be printed in the body of the RECORD instead of the Appendix.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AN EDITOR LOOKS AT SOME LAW—GOVERNMENT BY TREATY

(An address by William H. Fitzpatrick, editor of the New Orleans States, before the fifty-second annual meeting of the Nebraska State Bar Association, Omaha, Nebr., November 14, 1951)

Thank you, Mr. Toastmaster.

President Barkdull, President Davis, members of the Nebraska State Bar Association, honored guests, ladies and gentlemen, it is with considerable abashment that I find myself addressing this distinguished gathering. For an editor to attempt to lecture to lawyers on matters of law is a rather intrepid undertaking. Only the knowledge that I have yet to meet a lawyer who would not willingly lecture me on editorial writing has bolstered my courage for this trial. I beseech therefore your forbearance for the next half hour or so.

I am listed on the program for an address entitled "An Editor Looks at Some Law." What I am going to look at mostly I pray God will never become the law in this country. I am going to look at treaty law, and at some of the United Nations proposed treaties. I am going to look at the theory of government by treaty.

Those among you who are aware of the dangers of this subject matter will know that I feel that the American public is greatly indebted to the American Bar Association for its continued questioning of and lasting fight against such a theory of government. The deep study of lawyers of this country such as Frank E. Holman, who first spoke to you on this subject 2 years ago, Carl Rix, Alfred Schweppe and the fine leadership of such men as Harold Gallagher, Cody Fowler and Howard Barkdull, are convincing evidence of the bar's awareness of these dangers.

It is perhaps a generalization to say that Americans believe their liberties can be lost in two ways: by conquest from without and by conquest from within. I consider the latter more dangerous—because it is more subtle. By conquest from within I do not mean a seizure of the government by violence, with attendant bloodshed and pillage. I mean conquest of our ideas of government, of our concept of the relationship of a government of freemen to its people, by acceptance of little-understood so-called programs for peace.

We are told daily on the one hand that we are fighting in Korea to preserve our liberties and on the other that we must agree to proposals on the world scene which in the end may be as deadly to our liberties as conquest from without. We are told that we must give up this part of our sovereignty, forget about that freedom, in order to live safely in the world. It seems to me that many of us have forgotten the import of Patrick Henry's stirring words before the Virginia House of Burgesses:

"What is it that gentlemen wish? What would they have? Is life so dear or peace so sweet as to be purchased at the price of chains and slavery? Forbid it, Almighty God. I know not what course others may take, but as for me * * *."

Every school child in America knows the end of that famous quotation. But it took Attorney General Ike Murry, of Arkansas, to bring it up to date recently. He said that today such a statement would be considered a shoddy and inadequate platform, and completely unacceptable. Patrick Henry today would have to end that quotation, Mr. Murry said, like this:

"Give me liberty, a minimum intake of 3,000 calories daily, eight paid holidays a year, free medicine, a paper doily under every plate and two swizzle sticks in my old-fashioneds, or give me death, provided social security pays my funeral expenses."

I do not mean to make a Fourth of July speech here. But there was a Fourth of July, and such speeches as Henry's were the marrow of the bone of our country's strength. I prefer them to the manifestoes of faint hearts who would lay all we hold dear a sacrifice to compromise on a godless altar they have raised and named Necessity.

Its true name is world government. We are told that it will be democratic, a representative form of government. That means a common citizenship, a common coin, a common law. It means we will be outvoted in any world Congress by the dictators because they control more people than there are of us and they will have more representatives. It means we will have no more immigration laws to keep undesirables out of this country; it means we will be impotent to prevent the laying of taxes on this country to dry up the fruits of our own industry; it may mean the destruction of rights such as trial by jury and free speech.

Government by treaty is just one step short of world government. There are a number of dangerous treaties which have been proposed by the United Nations. I shall discuss only two of these: The Genocide Convention and the Covenant on Human Rights. First, I shall show how these treaties can become the law of the land—though they never pass the Congress as such.

The United States Constitution provides that the President, by and with the consent of the United States Senate, has the power to enter into treaties with foreign nations. If two-thirds of the Senate—present when the treaty comes to a vote, mind you, not necessarily two-thirds of the entire membership—votes to ratify a treaty, that treaty becomes the supreme law of the land.

At the same time, all treaties supersede State laws, and all State constitutions, and all city and county and municipal law.

This is so, because the United States Constitution provides, in article II, section 2, paragraph 2, that:

"He (the President) shall have the power by and with the consent of the Senate to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur * * *."

And because article VI, section 2, provides that:

"This Constitution and the laws of the United States which shall be made in pursuance thereof and all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States, shall be the supreme law of the land, and the judges in every State shall be bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding."

In other words, the President and the Senate alone can act to override any State laws through the device of treaty enactment.

The Genocide Convention is the outgrowth of international revulsion at the mass executions perpetrated on helpless peoples by Hitler and his underlings.

On June 7 of this year, the papers all had page 1 stories telling of the executions of 7 notorious Nazi war criminals for the murder of 2,000,000 peoples in concentration camps.

These Nazi war criminals were convicted at the Nuremberg trials, which resulted from the establishment of an international military tribunal. They were the last of 275 executed by order of the war crimes tribunals.

These murderers paid the penalty of their monstrous crimes. They committed these crimes because it was the Hitler program of extermination of minorities. That is what most of us think of when we hear of genocide.

But would they have come under the Genocide Convention if it had been in effect when their crimes were committed?

George Finch, editor of the American Journal of International Law and a student of the convention since its inception, testified before a Senate subcommittee January a year ago:

"As genocide is defined in the convention, it does not apply to the mass killings and destruction of peoples by totalitarian governments, but appeases such governments by making it possible for them to continue, as they are doing today behind the iron curtain, the monstrous treatment of thousands of human beings whom those governments regard as enemies of the Communist states. There is not a word in the convention which denounces as genocide the mass killings and destruction of peoples by governments."

It goes without saying that no decent person can quarrel with the announced objectives of this convention—the outlawing of mass murder of a racial, religious or ethnical group. The very word Buchenwald will live forever as a measure of the depths of mankind's degradation. But the Genocide Convention goes far beyond these announced objectives. The Genocide Convention makes mandatory the shipment overseas of Americans accused of genocide committed abroad, and proponents of the convention plan a criminal chamber to try any American accused of genocide wherever the International Court of Justice might be sitting even when that alleged offense was committed in his own home. What happens here to the American right to trial by jury in the State and district in which the crime allegedly occurred, as is guaranteed all of us by article VI of the Bill of Rights?

The Genocide Convention includes among its violations the causing of mental harm. What court will spell out for us just what this means? The lawyers of this country do not know. The final arbiter of this question will be the International Court of Justice, for that court has the right to determine any question of interpretation of the convention. Thus, the International Court of Justice is in a position to determine American law, a prerogative up till now reserved solely to the United States Congress and United States courts.

The Covenant on Human Rights likewise threatens our Bill of Rights. It specifically endangers four of our most precious heritages. These are freedom of worship, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of peaceful assembly.

The covenant threatens them by limiting and restricting them. Let me read to you the first amendment to the United States Constitution:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion, or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; or abridging the freedom of speech, or of the press, or of the right of the people peaceably to assemble, and to petition the Government for a redress of grievances * * *."

There are no exceptions to these rights in our Constitution. But the Covenant on Human Rights contains so many restrictions, so many exceptions, and so many limitations that they are no longer rights freemen hold, but grants by government which, in many cases, under the covenant, can be taken away whenever a government decides to call a national emergency.

Let me repeat part of article I of the Bill of Rights:

"Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof; * * *."

Those words are the cornerstone of freedom of worship in the United States. Under their protection Protestant, Catholic, Jew, Christian Scientist, Hindu, and Moslem have been secure in their right and desire to worship their God as they chose. Agnostic and atheist have been equally secure in their right to question or to disbelieve.

Those words are unequivocal, given to no other judicial interpretation through the years than these:

The Congress can establish no state religion; and

The Congress is prohibited from interfering with religious worships or beliefs.

After the United States Constitution had been ratified by the States, fear of a strong centralized Government arose. The Bill of Rights was written to allay these fears. But the prohibition against Government interference in religious worship did not lead the list of freedoms in the Bill of Rights by accident.

Freedom of worship was deep-rooted in the history and mores of the people, for those who believed in freedom of worship had helped found the country. It was a desire for religious freedom that brought the Pilgrims to Plymouth Rock, William Penn's Quakers to Pennsylvania, and Lord Baltimore's Catholics to Maryland, more than a century before George Mason wrote the Bill of Rights.

This freedom of worship which Americans have recognized as the right of each individual is endangered by the draft Covenant on Human Rights.

Paragraph 2 of article 13 of the Covenant on Human Rights reads:

"Freedom to manifest one's religion or beliefs shall be subject only to such limitations as are pursuant to law and are reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, health, or morals or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others."

What effects will this have if this covenant is ratified by the Senate as a treaty? A treaty accepted by two-thirds of the Senators present becomes the law of the land. If the Supreme Court validates this treaty, it can nullify the religious freedom in the Bill of Rights by granting the Government the power to limit and restrict the free exercise of religion.

The committee for peace and law through the United Nations of the American Bar Association has said the effects also would be these:

"We are confronted with a concept of the freedom of religion embracing the free use of limitations reasonable and necessary to protect public safety, order, health, morals, or the fundamental rights and freedoms of others. The purported agreement of church and state in Hungary is an example of religion under state regulation and control for public safety and order.

"The people of the United States are asked to approve those restrictions for others on the assurance that perhaps they will not apply in the United States. The persecuted brethren of any religious group in any country dominated by the Soviet shall be assured that such persecutions are legal and proper under a Covenant of Human Rights because the public safety and order of their state demand such protective action. Is this the message we shall send to persecuted worshipers in other lands?

"Today, when an atheistic ideology of great power and proportions confronts the religious groups of the world, an organ of the United Nations presents the doctrine of state regulation of religion, a codification of the right of regulation, and complete destruction of the freedom of religion if laws based on alleged public safety and order of the state shall so provide."

For this danger to religion, among other reasons, the American Bar Association has twice condemned the covenant.

Article 14 of the Covenant on Human Rights sets forth rights and privileges of speech and the press, and then limits them to a degree heretofore unheard of in free countries.

Similar restrictions are placed upon the right of peaceful assembly in article 15.

Article 14 reads:

"1. Everyone shall have the right to hold opinions without interference.

"2. Everyone shall have the right to freedom of expression; this right shall include freedom to seek, receive and impart information and ideas of all kinds, regardless of frontiers, either orally, in writing or in print, in the form of art, or through any other media of his choice.

"3. The right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities, and restrictions, but these shall be such only as are provided by law and are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals, or of the rights, freedoms or reputations of others."

Article 15 reads:

"The right to peaceful assembly shall be recognized. No restrictions shall be placed on the exercise of this right other than those imposed in conformity with the law and which are necessary to ensure national security, public order, the protection of health or morals or the protection of the rights and freedoms of others."

And as if these limitations and restrictions on these vital rights were not enough, article 2 of the covenant gives signatory nations the privilege of canceling articles 14 and 15 among others "in the case of a state of emergency officially proclaimed by the authorities * * *."

Are opponents of these treaties alarmists, as is claimed by those pressing the Senate to ratify them, or are they presenting valid arguments?

Those opposed to the covenant include the American Bar Association, the American Newspaper Publishers' Association, and jurists, both Federal and State; a growing number of newspapers, university presidents, and law-school deans, and Members of the United States Senate.

These organizations and people believe the covenant unacceptable to the American form of government as we know it.

But is there any judicial basis for their fears?

What has been the attitude of the United States Supreme Court in the matter of treaties?

Let's look at the record.

The Supreme Court has never expressly declared any treaty ratified by the Senate invalid.

The Supreme Court has upheld a law enacted to place teeth in a treaty after the same law had been declared unconstitutional before the treaty was ratified.

This instance of the Supreme Court ruling that the treaty-making power could be used successfully where the Constitution forbade the Congress to act is pointed to by Frank E. Holman, of Seattle, a former president of the American Ear Association, as a blank check for writing a new constitution.

Here's how it came about: In 1913, Congress enacted a Federal Migratory Bird Act. After its approval by the President, its constitutionality was questioned on the grounds that it invaded the reserved powers of the States, and the statute was declared unconstitutional in 1914 by the United States court in the eastern district of Arkansas in *United States* v. *Shauver*, and again in 1915

in *United States* v. *McCullogh* in a Federal court in Kansas.

Supporters of the regulations governing the taking of migratory birds then sought the treaty route. The President concluded a treaty with Great Britain and the Senate ratified it.

A second Migratory Bird Act was then enacted. It was practically identical with the first, and it was attacked as unconstitutional also.

This time the Supreme Court, in *Missouri* v. *Holland,* upheld the law as valid since it was implementation of a valid treaty.

"This decision," Mr. Holman writes, "in effect, and really for the first time, opened the way for amending the Constitution of the United States by and through a treaty, because it proclaims that an otherwise unconstitutional law may become constitutional when, as and if the President negotiates a treaty on the subject and obtains approval of the Senate."

This is nothing more nor less than government by treaty.

The case of William N. Oatis, correspondent in Czechoslovakia for the Associated Press who was sentenced to 10 years at hard labor as a spy by that Red regime, has aroused considerable discussion in America during the past 3 months.

Oatis, according to Associated Press records, has been employed by that wire service since 1937. He is an American who worked in Indianapolis, New York, and London before being sent to Prague. His record was excellent. He was objective and unbiased.

A communication issued by the board of directors of the Associated Press, which pledged its continuing efforts to effect, if possible, the release of Mr. Oatis, reads, in part:

"Developments at his trial indicated the pattern in which a man can be convicted of so-called espionage when he has done no more than report established facts and daily developments in the country to which he is accredited. The statute under which he was tried appears to be so all-embracing that a prosecutor and court could, if desired, find his activities in conflict with the law if a correspondent recorded anything about public events in words other than those authorized by the Czechoslovak Government."

Said another way, that means that a man may be found guilty of espionage if he attempts to rewrite a propaganda hand-out and tell the truth.

The case of Cardinal Mindszenty is well-known. He was accused of espionage and conspiring to return the monarchy to Hungary. Just this year the primate, Archbishop Groesz, was sentenced to 15 years in a mock trial in Budapest for virtually the same thing. The Hungarian Government demanded the withdrawal of two members of the American Legation on charges that they had conspired with the Archbishop, an allegation so false that the United States has refused that request.

These mock trials, arising from unjust laws, have stirred the country into a realization that our ideas of justice and our beliefs in the rights of individuals do not quite fit into the pattern of European communism.

Yet, this is the philosophy we are being asked to accept for Americans abroad and at home in the Covenant on Human Rights. The covenant makes such persecutions legal and proper.

Hungary and Czechoslovakia have followed the covenant in the cases of the Cardinal and the Archbishop and Mr. Oatis to the letter.

This is the sort of "freedom" our Senate may be asked to enact as law of the United States by ratification of a treaty, if the covenant comes to our Senate unchanged.

We will not only be saying that what these European Communist states have done in the cases of the church and the press is eminently right, but we will be agreeing that it ought to be done here, too.

An American bar association committee named to study this proposed treaty says that under it:

"The Government could, for example, close down newspapers just as in other emergencies the President has closed down banks."

The Government could also close down universities and radio stations, seize and burn books and pamphlets and disperse any assembly of citizens gathered together to question such steps.

So far I have discussed only the so-called civil and political rights the covenant grants, and the manner in which they conflict with our Bill of Rights.

The covenant, however, is also a blueprint for socialism. Article 19 reads:

"The states parties to the present covenant * * * undertake to take steps, individually and through international cooperation, to the maximum of their available resources with a view to achieving progressively the full realization of the rights recognized in this part of the present covenant."

What the Federal Government is asked to provide "individually and through international cooperation" to the maximum of our available resources is made clear in the covenant.

Article 22 says: "The states parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to social security."

Article 23 says: "The states parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to adequate housing."

Article 24 says: "The states parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to an adequate standard of living and the continuous improvement of living conditions."

All of these are "rights provided by the state" (art. 32) which the state can limit or reject at any time "for the purpose of promoting the general welfare in a democratic society." Thus the state is empowered to control the scale of living.

The covenant also obligates us to place both education and the medical profession under Government control.

The covenant strikes at both secondary and higher education in article 28. This article reads:

"The states parties to the covenant recognize:

"1. The right of everyone to education;

"4. That secondary education, in its different forms, including technical and professional secondary education, shall be generally available and shall be made progressively free;

"5. That higher education shall be equally accessible to all on the basis of merit and that all be made progressively free;"

Article 32 of the covenant designates these as "rights provided the states * * *."

Since the covenant will be the law of the land if ratified as a treaty, the Federal Government will be obligated legally to provide progressively free secondary and higher education throughout the country. This increasing control of education will affect all endowed institutions, all religious colleges and universities, and all State institutions. Federal aid to education will eventually become Federal control of education. Education will become propaganda, for control of the budget means control of the textbooks.

Socialized medicine is also planned in the covenant.

Article 24 reads, in part:

"The states parties to the covenant recognize the right of everyone to the enjoyment of the highest standard of health obtainable. With a view to implementing and safeguarding this right each state party hereto undertakes to provide legislative measures to promote and protect health and, in particular:

"(IV) to provide conditions which would assure the right of all to medical service and medical attention in the event of sickness."

This also is one of the "rights provided by the state" in the covenant. If ratified by the Senate, this right will become an obligation of the Federal Government. Such an obligation can be carried out only by socialization of the entire medical profession, from test tube to stethoscope, from prescription blank to surgeon's knife.

You will not fail to have noted that so far in this address I have quoted only as authorities those opposed to ratification of the Genocide Convention and the covenant. There is of course the other side of the question.

Most of the testimony by advocates of ratification which I have studied, either in their writings or in testimony before the Senate subcommittee hearings on the Genocide Convention, displayed an appalling lack of knowledge of the impact of the convention on the Constitution, or they fell back on the old phrase, "It can't happen here."

But it can happen here. It has already happened here. You may have heard of the Fujii case, in which the validity of the Alien Land Law of California was attacked. We are not concerned here with the morality of the law, which forbade aliens to acquire land in California if they were ineligible to citizenship, though it might be a wise law in Tennessee in the vicinity of Oak Ridge. We are concerned with the fact that it was a State law, struck down by a California court of appeal. The court held that the law was valid under the California Constitution, and the United States Constitution, but that it was invalid under articles 55 and 56 of the United Nations Charter forbidding discrimination because the Charter, being a treaty which the United States had ratified, is the supreme law of the land. And this was held despite article 2, which clearly states that nothing in the Charter is to be interpreted as interfering with the domestic jurisdiction of signatory nations. This decision, of course, is now before the California Supreme Court and doubtless will go to the high court before final decision. But if it stands as the court of appeals has held, it effectively nullifies all so-called domestic saving clauses or Federal-State clauses in future treaties.

The most voluble of the special pleaders for enactment of such treaties is Prof. Zechariah Chafee, who teaches law at Harvard. Professor Chafee has committed to print, just this year, in the Wisconsin Law Review, a long dissertation on Federal and State Powers Under the U. N. Covenant on Human Rights. It takes a deal of patience and ingenuity to attempt this essay. But I have done so in a spirit of duty. I must confess that I approached his reasonings with preconceived ideas. My study was not an open-minded one. That attitude served to place me, in that respect, on equal ground with the professor, for his articles are extensive apologia for the covenant, which he himself helped to write.

I need quote only a few passages from this witness for the defense. I shall present his own testimony as the strongest case against ratification.

Professor Chafee's basic assumption, which critics of the covenant do not admit, is that it will not be self-executing. He then proceeds to doubt his own assumption, when he says:

"A little difficulty is presented by the requirement of article VI that 'the laws of the United States' must be 'made in pursuance' of the Constitution to become 'the supreme law of the land' whereas this phrase is not

repeated as to 'treaties'. The only express qualifications as to them is 'all treaties made, or which shall be made, under the authority of the United States * * *' This difference in phraseology does permit of an argument that treaties do not have to comply with the Constitution."

"Little difficulty," indeed.

But he overcomes this difficulty further on, saying: "If any of its provisions do 'really impair the principles of the first amendment,' no harm will be done," because if the treaty is self-executing, which he is not sure of, nobody will dare do anything about it.

"If the narrow interpretation of the first amendment be sound, the President and two-thirds of the Senators present can adopt a treaty which calls for—as an example—censorship of the press. They can, but they won't. If they would, they wouldn't be where they are. That sort of thing just doesn't happen in this kind of country."

I pause here momentarily for station identification, to remind you that this is a professor of law discussing the effect of the treaty power. He would rely on the self-restraint of politicians rather than the restraint of the Constitution.

In another blithe passage, Professor Chafee says: "I fully recognize that we ought not to sacrifice our Federal system all of a sudden because of the covenant." He would rather go it little by little. He thinks it unwise, for instance, to include all the rights, such as social security, unemployment relief, adequate rest and leisure, health, food, clothing, housing, medical care because "the resulting complexity may merely scare away potential signers or make the operation of the covenant break down. * * * it is wise," he writes, "not to attempt a great deal at the start. If moderate measures work well, more can be added later."

In parts, Professor Chafee's articles remind one of an angered father's retort to the doctors who tell him that his favorite child is not quite right in the head. He calls all opposed the hostile critics, and goes so far at one point as to say: "The strongest proof of the absurdity of these insinuations is to look at the people who drafted article 14. I have worked side by side with every American who has had anything to do with article 14, and a good many of the foreigners. The person in charge is Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt.

"One prominent lawyer considers the covenant dangerous because she is not a lawyer, and all the other members of the Human Rights Commission are, surprisingly, foreigners * * *. What Mrs. Roosevelt contributes to the Human Rights Commission are qualities very few lawyers possess. She has vision and imagination." This last blanket indictment of the legal profession is difficult for a layman to understand, especially as Professor Chafee's entire philippic against the hostile critics accuses them of envisioning dangers that aren't there, and of imagination verging on the hysterical.

Consider now the position of Mr. William Fleming, whose article, Danger to America: The Draft Covenant on Human Rights, some of you may have read in the October and November issues of the Bar Association's Journal. Mr. Fleming is chairman of the department of political science at Ripon College, in Wisconsin.

He writes: "Part III—of the covenant—is nothing else but the perfect embodiment of the unadulterated welfare state and unmitigated socialism."

He says: "For Americans 'an independent and impartial tribunal' as prescribed by the covenant is still a far cry from trial by jury. Americans will also look in vain for a prohibition stipulating that no one shall be subject for the same offense to be put twice in jeopardy of life or limb. They will look in vain for a prohibition against the requirement of excessive bail. They will look in vain for a prohibition against compelling a man to be a witness against himself. They will look in vain for rules of evidence designed to curb the otherwise arbitrary power of a court to admit evidence at its discretion."

And he says: "The nations of the world, far from accepting American ideas on liberty, have succeeded in inducing the American delegation to accept their views. In other words, the efforts of the United States to bestow the blessings of liberty on the world as a whole have boomeranged. The crusading missionary home from abroad finds himself converted to the creed of the nonbelievers to whom he was supposed to teach the Gospel. What a spectacle ludicrous and tragic at once."

And he says: "In the last analysis, ratification of the covenant would amount to introducing world government through a back door."

And he says: "It is a well known general rule that the Constitution means what the court says it means. It stands to reason that the question whether or not provisions of the covenant limit the Constitution will also be ultimately decided by the court. The court may consider the treaty as being 'of equal dignity with our Bill of Rights,' as the committee on peace and law reported in September 1949. Thus, the American system is clearly put in jeopardy. If one is disturbed over taking such a right with the court, as one certainly should be, nonratification of the draft covenant is the only sound solution."

There is, however, a final solution. That is to cure the treaty clause by amending the Constitution to prevent any treaty from invading the domestic law unless already authorized by the Constitution, and to prevent any treaty from changing our form of government. It is a solution the American Bar Association is now considering. Let us hope they agree upon the form and terminology during President Barkdull's term.

Thomas Jefferson wrote in the Declaration of Independence:

"Prudence, indeed, will dictate that governments long established should not be changed for light or transient causes * * *."

Yet we are asked to limit, except and restrict historic rights simply to meet upon a common ground of agreement with other nations whose people do not understand, nor value, nor in some cases desire the freedoms of which we are the inheritors.

I do not think that all of us realize the full measure of our Constitution. It was written by men wise in the ways of government; men who had taken from this country's law the best it offered, and from that its very best, so that when it was fashioned they had created, in the words of William Gladstone:

"The most wonderful work ever struck off at a given time by the brain and purpose of man."

Is that a thing to be discarded lightly? I think not. Yet there is some sentiment dedicated to the theory that the United States Constitution is an outmoded document, more appropriate to the Smithsonian Institution than to the Halls of Congress. We would be better off, this sentiment holds, were we to be ruled by an oligarchy of intellectuals in a hurry to do for us the things they think need doing. This can lead only to dictatorship, complete and irrevocable, no matter how benevolent its beginnings.

Let us turn to the Federalist papers for proof that the treaty power was never meant as a vehicle for domestic legislation or for an assault, however unintentional, upon the Bill of Rights. Madison, Hamilton, and Jay were brilliant students of government. Hamilton was most specific on the treaty power. He said:

"The power of making treaties relates neither to the execution of subsisting laws; nor to the enaction of new ones. * * *"

It was inconceivable to these men that the treaty power would ever be used to attack our freedoms and liberties. Had it occurred to them, you may be sure a prohibition would have been placed in the Bill of Rights before it was anchored in the Constitution 160 years ago.

Our Republic, flourishing under our Constitution, is the greatest form of government mankind has yet devised to promote individual liberty under law. We can say, with Lincoln:

"Most governments have been based, practically, on the denial of the equal rights of man; ours began by affirming those rights.

"We made the experiment; and the fruit is before us. Look at it—think of it."

We can add, I think—cherish it and guard it well; watch over it and hold it dear. If we lose it, we, and our children's children, may never see its like again.

Mr. BUTLER of Nebraska. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent that immediately following the previous insertion there be printed an editorial on the same subject from the Omaha World-Herald of December 17, 1951.

There being no objection, the editorial was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

A HOLIDAY THAT FAILED

Three years ago last week—on December 10, 1948—the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted its Declaration of Human Rights.

One-worlders take the view that this was one of the most transcendentally significant days in the history of mankind. Consequently they proposed that December 10, 1951, be set aside as a sort of holiday, a day of jubilation, the Nation around.

To judge by the news dispatches of last week, the plan didn't quite come off. Two or three mayors issued proclamations, but if there was any widespread dancing in the streets, that fact was not reported in the press.

The Declaration of Human Rights is a typically New Dealish document—naive in its approach and from the traditional American point of view, vicious in its implications. It puts into high-sounding words the creed of Socialists, welfare-staters, and miscellaneous do-gooders the world around.

Here as a few fragments which will serve to convey the general flavor of the thing:

"Everyone has the right to a standard of living adequate for the health and well-being of himself and his family, including food, clothing, housing, and medical care and the necessary social services, and the right to security in the event of unemployment, sickness, disability, widowhood, old age, or other lack of livelihood in circumstances beyond his control.

"Everyone, as a member of society, has the right to social security and is entitled to realization, through national effort and international cooperation and in accordance with the organization and resources of each state, of the economic, social, and cultural rights indispensable for his dignity and the free development of his personality. * * *"

Need we go on?

The rights referred to in the declaration are not those with which people are endowed by their Creator and which are affirmed in the American Declaration of Independence.

Rather, the U. N. refers to "rights" which must be supplied by the state (such as the astonishing right to social services, as quoted above). These "rights" must be paid for by other taxpayers.

The American Declaration of Independence says people have a right to be free of big, despotic government. The socialistic declaration of the United Nations argues

the cause of big government and upholds its right to suckle and dominate all.

The two are as opposite as right and wrong.

In itself the Declaration of Human Rights has no legal standing anywhere on earth. It is simply a collection of socialistic words, thrown to the winds.

But there comes now the time for what the left-wing comrades call "implementation." Even as these words are being written a committee of the United Nations is meeting in Paris, trying to draft a covenant of human rights, which, if adopted by the U. N., will be submitted to member nations for ratification. If approved by the United States Senate, competent attorneys hold that this covenant would have the same force and effect as if it were a part of the Constitution of the United States.

What this covenant will contain when completed, nobody knows. But the draft which was prepared last spring, and which now is being worked on in Paris, follows the same socialistic slant as the declaration quoted above. In addition, in many sly ways it would undermine the American Constitution.

For example, consider this section:

"The right to seek, receive and impart information and ideas carries with it special duties and responsibilities, and may therefore be subject to certain penalties, liabilities and restrictions, but these shall be such only as are provided by law and are necessary for the protection of national security, public order, safety, health or morals," etc.

If added to the Constitution now, in the form of a treaty, this section would wipe out freedom of speech, freedom of the press, and freedom of religion—because it would make those rights discretionary with the Federal Government.

Many suggestions have been made for changing the proposed covenant to make it less objectionable, but the best plan of all, we think, would be for the American members of the U. N. committee (headed by Eleanor Roosevelt, incidentally) to drop the whole socialistic mess and head for home.

If they will follow that counsel, the date of their departure from Paris might well be celebrated, in years to come as a national holiday—and a far more popular one than the recent Human Rights Day.

REPEAL OF SECTION 104 OF DEFENSE PRODUCTION ACT OF 1950—AMENDMENT

Mr. BRICKER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my amendment on the pending bill, S. 2104, to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, may be considered as pending. I intended to offer it yesterday. I want the RECORD to show that I have offered an amendment to the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be considered as having been offered, and will lie on the table. There being no other amendment pending, the Chair understands that the Senator from Ohio wants his amendment regarded as being the first amendment offered.

Mr. BRICKER. I want the RECORD to show that the amendment has been offered to the pending bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

The roll was called, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Hayden	McFarland
Anderson	Hendrickson	McKellar
Bennett	Hennings	McMahon
Benton	Hill	Millikin
Bricker	Hoey	Moody
Bridges	Holland	Morse
Butler, Md.	Humphrey	Mundt
Butler, Nebr.	Hunt	Murray
Byrd	Ives	Neely
Cain	Jenner	O'Mahoney
Capehart	Johnson, Colo.	Pastore
Carlson	Johnson, Tex.	Robertson
Case	Johnston, S. C.	Russell
Clements	Kefauver	Saltonstall
Connally	Kem	Schoeppel
Cordon	Kerr	Smathers
Dirksen	Kilgore	Smith, Maine
Douglas	Knowland	Smith, N. J.
Dworshak	Langer	Smith, N. C.
Ecton	Lodge	Sparkman
Ellender	Long	Stennis
Ferguson	Magnuson	Taft
Flanders	Malone	Thye
Frear	Martin	Tobey
Fulbright	Maybank	Underwood
George	McCarran	Welker
Gillette	McCarthy	Wiley
Green	McClellan	Williams

Mr. JOHNSON of Texas. I announce that the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. EASTLAND], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], and the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY] are absent on official business.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I announce that the Senator from Maine [Mr. BREWSTER] is necessarily absent.

The Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER] and the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. SEATON] are absent by leave of the Senate on public business.

The Senator from California [Mr. NIXON] and the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS] and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] are absent by leave of the Senate.

CALL OF THE CALENDAR

The VICE PRESIDENT. A quorum is present.

Under the unanimous-consent agreement entered into yesterday, the calendar will now be called from the beginning for the consideration of measures to which there is no objection. The Secretary will call the first bill on the calendar.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 32) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges traveling while attending court or transacting official business at places other than their official stations and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at the rate of 7 cents per mile, was announced as first in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina objects. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 618) to prohibit the parking of vehicles upon any property owned by the United States for postal purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

The bill (H. R. 36) to amend title 28, United States Code, section 456, so as to increase to $15 per day the limit on subsistence expenses allowed to justices and judges while attending court or transacting business at places other than their official station, and to authorize reimbursement for such travel by privately owned automobiles at a rate of not exceeding 7 cents per mile was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina objects. The bill will go over.

The bill (H. R. 2929) to authorize the Postmaster General to prohibit or regulate the use of Government property under his custody and control for the parking or storage of vehicles was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is a companion bill to the second bill on the calendar.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

The bill (S. 35) to provide for the appointment of deputy United States marshals without regard to the provisions of the civil service laws and regulations was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This bill was reported adversely. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

The bill (S. 50) to provide for the admission of Alaska into the Union was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over at the request of numerous Senators.

The bill (S. 49) to enable the people of Hawaii to form a constitution and State government and to be admitted into the Union on an equal footing with the original States was announced as next in order.

SEVERAL SENATORS. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over at the request of numerous Senators.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 3) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relative to equal rights for men and women was announced as next in order.

Mr. RUSSELL. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over at the request of the Senator from Georgia.

The bill (H. R. 1590) for the reimbursement of the S. A. Healy Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will go over.

The bill (H. R. 2119) to amend sections 544 and 546 of title 28, United States Code, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from South Carolina objects, and the bill will be passed over.

The Chair thinks that, in the interest of orderly procedure, Senators who wish to object to the consideration of bills should rise and be recognized by the Chair; otherwise it is impossible for the clerks always to know what Senator objects.

The Secretary will call the next measure on the calendar.

WEIGHT TO BE GIVEN IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA TO EVIDENCE OF CERTAIN TESTS FOR CERTAIN OFFENSES

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 951) to prescribe the weight to be given to evidence of tests of alcohol in the blood, urine, or breath of persons tried in the District of Columbia for certain offenses committed while operating vehicles, which had been reported from the Committee on the District of Columbia with an amendment, which had heretofore been agreed to, on page 1, line 8, after "March 3", to strike out "1923" and insert "1925", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That if, as a result of the operation of a vehicle any person is tried in any court of competent jurisdiction within the District of Columbia for (1) operating such vehicle while under the influence of any intoxicating liquor in violation of section 10 (b) of the District of Columbia Traffic Act, 1925, approved March 3, 1925, as amended (D. C. Code, title 40, sec. 609), (2) negligent homicide in violation of section 802 (a) of the act entitled "An act to establish a code of law for the District of Columbia," approved March 3, 1901, as amended (D. C. Code, title 40, sec. 606), or (3) manslaughter committed in the operation of such vehicle in violation of section 802 of such act approved March 3, 1901 (D. C. Code, title 22, sec. 2405), and in the course of such trial there is received in evidence competent proof to the effect that at the time of such operation—

(1) defendant's blood or urine contained five one-hundredths of 1 percent or less, by weight, of alcohol, or that an equivalent quantity of alcohol was contained in 2,000 cubic centimeters of his breath (true breath or alveolar air having 5½ percent of carbon dioxide), such proof shall be deemed prima facie proof that defendant at such time was not under the influence of any intoxicating liquor;

(2) defendant's blood or urine contained more than five one-hundredths of 1 percent, but less than fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent, by weight, of alcohol, or that an equivalent quantity of alcohol was contained in 2,000 cubic centimeters of his breath (true breath or alveolar air having 5½ percent of carbon dioxide), such proof shall constitute relevant evidence, but shall not constitute prima facie proof that defendant was or was not at such time under the influence of any intoxicating liquor; and

(3) defendant's blood or urine contained fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent or more, by weight, of alcohol, or that an equivalent quantity of alcohol was contained in 2,000 cubic centimeters of his breath (true breath or alveolar air having 5½ percent of carbon dioxide), such proof shall constitute prima facie proof that defendant at such time was under the influence of intoxicating liquor.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1414) for the relief of the E. J. Albrecht Co. was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 1376) providing for the dissolution of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the transfer of certain functions related to national defense heretofore vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that the bill go over, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 172) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act of 1917, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Washington objects, and the bill goes over.

EVALUATION OF FISCAL REQUIREMENTS OF EXECUTIVE AGENCIES—AMENDMENT OF LEGISLATIVE REORGANIZATION ACT OF 1946—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 913) to amend the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 to provide for the more effective evaluation of the fiscal requirements of the executive agencies of the Government of the United States, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I believe this bill is of considerable importance and should not be passed by unanimous consent, but should be discussed and weighed on its merits. However, I believe the bill is of such importance that it should receive early consideration by this body.

I have discussed this measure and the possibility of having the Senate consider it, with the able majority leader at various times, even during the closing days of the last session of Congress, at which time we were assured that the majority leader would undertake to have the bill brought up early during the present session.

I have since conferred with the majority leader, and I believe I have his assurance now that at the next meeting, next Tuesday, of the majority policy committee, this bill will be presented to that committee for discussion and for action by it.

Let me inquire of the distinguished majority leader whether I am correct in that regard.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, let me say to my distinguished friend, the Senator from Arkansas, that the bill has been pending for some time. At the last meeting of the majority policy committee, a request was made to delay any action on the bill until the Appropriations Committee had an opportunity to discuss it. I understand that the Appropriations Committee now has done so; and I will take up the bill again with the Majority Policy Committee on Tuesday.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished majority leader, and I wish to say to all Members now present that if ever in the history of the Nation there was need for the Federal Government to practice economy, that time is now.

I believe it is recognized by all that, as presently constituted, the machinery of the Congress is not adequate to enable members of the Appropriations Committees or other Members of Congress to inquire into the items which are contained in the $85,000,000,000 budget and to act wisely and judiciously in making determination in respect either to the justification for the items themselves or the justification for the amounts requested by the spending agencies.

Mr. President, it is the purpose of this bill to better equip the Congress to meet that responsibility and to enable it to bring about some economies in the appropriations—economies which are justified, although today we are not able to determine just where such economies can be made.

This bill, if enacted, will enable us to obtain that information and will enable us to do the job which it is the constitutional responsibility and duty of the Congress to do.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Arkansas yield to me?

Mr. McCLELLAN. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I agree with the Senator from Arkansas about the necessity for economy in the Government all along the line, and I also agree with the Senator about the disposition of the Congress to effect economies. The Senator from Arkansas and I have made a splendid fight all along that line.

I wish to say further that this bill has a relationship to the bill which was discussed at the last meeting of the committee.

Mr. McCLELLAN. I may advise the distinguished Senator that it is the bill which was discussed there.

Mr. McKELLAR. Does the bill provide for the appointment of a joint committee?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes, it does—a joint committee on the budget.

Mr. McKELLAR. That would be a joint committee of the two Houses to look into that matter. Is that correct?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Yes.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will not the Senator from Arkansas allow the bill to go over at this time?

Mr. McCLELLAN. Oh, yes; I have stated that the bill is of such great importance that it should not be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, I wish to concur in everything the Senator from Arkansas has said.

Furthermore, I wish to say that at the present time we are investigating the manpower situation. We believe that a bill along the line of this one would be a very good one for the Congress to enact. However, I wish to ask the Senator from Arkansas, if possible, to put off the bill for, let us say, 2 or 3 weeks, until we can look into this matter a little further, in order to be advised as to how to act more intelligently on it.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from South Carolina that it is not the purpose of the bill to interfere with the work of any committee, and the enactment of this bill would not interfere at all with the program the Senator from South Carolina has in mind. That program itself might be very helpful.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. The point is that at the present time I am studying some amendments to the bill which might be helpful along the same line.

Mr. McCLELLAN. If the distinguished Senator from South Carolina can find any way to improve the bill—and I am sure there are ways by which it can be improved—I know that those of us who are sponsoring this measure will welcome any amendment which will improve it and will help to achieve the objectives which it is designed to accomplish.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. That is the only reason why I am asking for 2 weeks' time—in order to be able to study the situation a little further.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, let me say to the Senator from South Carolina that I do not think there is any probability of having the bill brought up at an earlier date, but I wish to take every possible step to be sure that the bill will come up at that time.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Very well.

Mr. McCLELLAN. So, Mr. President, I now ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arkansas objects, and the bill will be passed over.

JOINT RESOLUTION AND BILLS PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 52) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the election of President and Vice President was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the joint resolution be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will go over.

The bill (S. 1748) to amend section 32 of the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, with reference to the designation of organizations as successors in interest to deceased persons, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1260) to authorize the acquisition of property for the establishment of a civil defense technical training school, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I inquire if the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL] is now on the floor?

Mr. McCARRAN. He left the floor a few minutes ago.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I spoke to the Senator from Georgia about this bill. I have not studied it with the degree of care with which I think the bill should be studied before we act on it. Therefore, I object to the present consideration of the bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee objects, and the bill goes over.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S.515) to amend the Reconstruction Finance Corporation Act, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Arizona objects, and the bill goes over.

JURISDICTION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS FOR BASIC AND OVERTIME COMPENSATION—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 751) to confer jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon certain claims for basic and overtime compensation, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, if the Senator would yield, I desire to inquire as to who made the objection, so I may confer with him.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas, on behalf of some other Senator, objects.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I ask the Senator whether he will inform me at whose instance he makes the objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Washington that objection was made at the instance of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. FERGUSON] and the Senator from Utah [Mr. WATKINS].

Mr. MAGNUSON. I thank the Senator.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

AMENDMENT OF IMMUNITY PROVISION REGARDING TESTIMONY OF WITNESSES BEFORE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1570) to amend the immunity provision relating to testimony given by witnesses before either House of Congress or their committees, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill goes over.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, would the Senator withhold his objection so that I may offer an amendment?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I shall be glad to withhold the objection.

The VICE PRESIDENT. There are committee amendments pending. If the Senator from Nevada wishes to offer another amendment, it will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this is an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendments. I am now offering an amendment as a substitute for the committee amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, the committee amendment on page 2, proposed to be inserted in lines 4 to 12, requires perfection in two respects. Credit for discovering the need for clarification should go to the legislative counsel of the Senate, Mr. John Simms, who, with Mr. Charles Boots, of the same office, developed the perfecting language.

The reason why perfective language is needed, Mr. President, is because there are two possible, though not probable, contingencies in the event of which the language embodied in the committee amendment might be found ambiguous.

One of these contingencies is the situation which would arise in the event a witness was called before the bar of one of the two Houses of Congress. The language of the committee amendment provides for a vote of two-thirds of the members of the full committee, to authorize that the witness be granted immunity. Obviously, there is no committee which could, by a vote of two-thirds of its membership or any other vote, take action binding upon the whole House or the whole Senate. Accordingly, it was thought desirable to include a special provision to cover this contingency; and the provision proposed is for the grant of immunity in such case to be authorized by a vote of a simple majority of the Members of the respective House.

The second contingency would be the situation arising in the case of a witness appearing before a joint committee, at a time when there was a party split, and one House of the Congress was controlled by one political party, the other House being controlled by another political

party. In such case, a joint committee would have an equal number of members from each party. In such case, language referring to the minority party would be ambiguous; and so it has been deemed desirable to change the language so as to refer to at least one member from each of the two political parties having the largest representation on such committee, which necessarily implies a majority and a minority party in the event where the two parties are not equally divided, but which also covers the contingency cited, namely, the case of a joint committee in a situation where one political party controls one House of Congress and another political party controls the other House.

With that explanation, Mr. President, I offer an amendment in the nature of a substitute for the committee amendment on page 2, in lieu of the matter proposed to be inserted in lines 4 to 12.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be printed and lie on the table.

PAYMENT OF ANNUITY TO WIDOWS OF JUDGES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 16) to provide for payment of an annuity to widows of judges was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, on previous occasions when this bill has been called, or a bill substantially similar to it has been called, I have offered an objection, and I should be compelled to offer an objection to the bill in its present form.

I should like to state very briefly the grounds for my objection, and to suggest a possible solution. As you know, Mr. President, this bill provides for noncontributory pensions to the widows of Federal justices, amounting to a rate of 5 percent a year of the salary multiplied by the number of years of service, but not to exceed 50 percent of the base salary. I emphasize that this a noncontributory pension, whereas the pension plan of the Federal Government, almost without exception, is contributory. I think there is only one exception to that rule, namely, in the case of the Foreign Service. Furthermore, it is at twice the rate provided for the civil service and for Members of this Congress, which is 2½ percent a year multiplied by the number of years of service.

I wish to have the Federal judiciary adequately paid; I think it is probable that the salary scale should be increased, but I do not desire to have what I regard as an unfair and an unjust privilege accorded to the judges of the United States, whereby without paying in a single cent, their widows shall be entitled to receive up to 50 percent of salary so long as they live. The precedent, once started in the case of judges, cannot be confined; almost certainly it will spread to other positions in the Federal courts. Therefore, in its present form, in spite of the pressure exerted by the judges' lobby—and I may say I think in many cases the judges have engaged in activities unbecoming to the Federal judiciary in attempting to have this bill passed—in spite of the judges' lobby, I shall have to object to the bill in its present form; but I should like to suggest that if the bill can be made contributory, with an adequate contribution by the judges, I shall withdraw my own opposition, and hope that the bill will be passed.

I would agree even to more liberal treatment than this bill provides, if it were made contributory, for surviving children; and I certainly will agree to the provision that widows of justices who have died in the past, for whom adequate provision has not been made from the private estates of such deceased judges, should be cared for, of course, without contribution. But I think the judges are going altogether too far in trying to obtain this privilege, and I cannot understand their obstinacy in refusing to agree to a contributory plan.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection of the Senator from Illinois, the bill goes over.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1475) to amend section 1 of the act to provide aviation education in the senior high scools of the District of Columbia, and for other purposes, approved December 16, 1941, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESDIENT. The Senator from New Jersey objects. The bill goes over.

The bill (H. R. 2737) to authorize the reimbursement of certain naval attachés, observers, and other officers for certain expenses incurred while on authorized missions in foreign countries, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. DOUGLAS. I object, and ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 18) to authorize suits against the United States to adjudicate and administer water rights was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I desire to object to this bill, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 1452) to promote the further development of public library service in rural areas, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. By request, I ask that this bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. On objection by the Senator from New Jersey, the bill goes over.

The bill (S.106) to amend the act entitled "An act to regulate the practice of optometry in the District of Columbia" was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over, by request.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill goes over.

The bill (S. 2137) to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the Administrator of General Services to enter into lease-purchase agreements to provide for the lease to the United States of real property and structures for terms of more than 8 years but not in excess of 25 years and for acquisition of title to such properties and structures by the United States at or before the expiration of the lease terms, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, on behalf of the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, was announced as next in order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. As this bill is the unfinished business, it will go over.

The bill (S. 2180) to provide for slaughter quotas and allocations of livestock was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas objects, and the bill goes over.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 27) providing for a consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Tennessee objects, and the concurrent resolution goes over.

EXTENSION OF YOUTH CORRECTION ACT TO DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

The bill (S. 1184) to extend the Youth Correction Act to the District of Columbia was announced as next in order.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, this bill simply allows District judges to adopt the same system authorized for the Federal courts in the various States. It allows the law to extend to the District of Columbia in District matters. In other words, as to any person who has not reached the age of 22 years, a judge may, at his discretion, remand that person to the parole section of the Department of Justice for investigation as to whether he should be sentenced or whether some other corrective measure should be taken.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1184) to extend the Youth Correction Act to the District of Columbia, which had been reported from the Committee on the Ju-

diciary with amendments on page 1, line 3, after the numerals "5023", to strike out "(a)"; and at the top of page 2, to insert:

(b) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed in any wise to amend, repeal, or affect the provisions of chapter 403 of this title (the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act), or limit the jurisdiction of the United States courts in the administration and enforcement of that chapter except that the powers as to parole of juvenile delinquents shall be exercised by the Division.

(c) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed in any wise to amend, repeal, or affect the provision of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia (ch. 9, title 11, of the D. C. Code).

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 5023, title 18 of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5023 (a) Nothing in this chapter shall limit or affect the power of any court to suspend the imposition or execution of any sentence and place a youth offender on probation or be construed in any wise to amend, repeal, or affect the provisions of chapter 231 of this title or the act of June 25, 1910 (ch. 433, 36 Stat. 864), as amended (ch. 1, title 24, of the D. of C. Code), both relative to probation.

"(b) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed in any wise to amend, repeal, or affect the provisions of chapter 403 of this title (the Federal Juvenile Delinquency Act), or limit the jurisdiction of the United States courts in the administration and enforcement of that chapter except that the powers as to parole of juvenile delinquents shall be exercised by the Division.

"(c) Nothing in this chapter shall be construed in any wise to amend, repeal, or affect the provisions of the Juvenile Court Act of the District of Columbia (ch. 9, title 11, of the D. C. Code)."

SEC. 2. Section 5024, title 18, of the United States Code is amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 5024. Where applicable: This chapter shall apply in the continental United States other than Alaska, and to youth offenders convicted in the District of Columbia of offenses under any law of the United States not applicable exclusively to such District, and to other youth offenders convicted in the District to the extent authorized under section 5025."

SEC. 3. (a) Chapter 402 of title 18, United States Code, is hereby amended by adding at the end thereof, immediately after section 5024, two new sections as follows:

"§ 5025. Applicability to District of Columbia prisoners.

"The District of Columbia is authorized either to provide its own facilities and personnel or to contract with the Director for the treatment and rehabilitation of committed youth offenders convicted of offenses under any law of the United States applicable exclusively to the District. Wherever undergoing treatment such committed youth offenders shall be subject to all the provisions of this chapter as though convicted of offenses not applicable exclusively to the District.

"§ 5026. Parole of other offenders not affected.

"Nothing in this chapter shall be construed as repealing or modifying the duties, power, or authority of the Board of Parole, or of the Board of Parole of the District of Columbia, with respect to the parole of United States prisoners, or prisoners convicted in the District of Columbia, respectively, not held to be committed youth offenders or juvenile delinquents."

(b) Section 3 (b) of the Act of September 30, 1950 (ch. 1115, 64 Stat. ——), relating to the Board of Parole is repealed.

SEC. 4. The analysis of chapter 402 of title 18 of the United States Code is amended by inserting immediately after and underneath item "Sec. 5024. Where applicable," two new items as follows:

"Sec. 5025. Applicability to District of Columbia prisoners.

"Sec. 5026. Parole of other offenders not affected."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the Youth Corrections Act to the District of Columbia."

BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1564) to make unlawful the transmission in interstate commerce of gambling information concerning a sporting event, which is obtained without consent of the person conducting such sporting event, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I ask that the bill be passed over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill goes over.

The bill (S. 1563) to provide for the licensing of certain persons engaged in the dissemination of information concerning horse- or dog-racing events and betting information concerning other sporting events by means of interstate and foreign communications by wire or radio, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, by request, I ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1624) to prohibit the importing, transporting, and mailing of gambling materials; to prohibit the broadcasting of gambling information; to prohibit the transmission of bets or wagers by means of interstate communications; and to prohibit further the transportation of gambling devices in interstate commerce was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I have been requested to ask that this bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2116) to prohibit transmission of certain gambling information in interstate commerce by communication facilities was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I make the same request, that this bill also go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 5) to amend section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, relating to the legislative budget, was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I ask that that concurrent resolution go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be passed over.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 107) to establish a Commission on Ethics in Government was announced as next in order.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I object.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I have not had an opportunity to study this joint resolution. I may be for it or against it, and I should like to have it go over until the next call of the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 1180) to facilitate the performance of research and development work by and on behalf of the Departments of the Army, the Navy, and the Air Force, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, clearly this is not a bill which should be passed on the unanimous-consent calendar, and I therefore ask that the bill go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

STUDY OF EFFECTS OF MALNUTRITION SUFFERED BY PRISONERS OF WAR AND CIVILIAN INTERNEES IN WORLD WAR II

The bill (S. 513) to provide for a study of the mental and physical consequences of malnutrition and starvation suffered by prisoners and civilian internees during World War II was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have an explanation of this bill, with particular reference to the type of service which might be rendered by the Veterans' Administration as compared with that which might be rendered to such an unfortunate individual by the War Claims Commission. I understand the distinguished Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS] is interested in the question, and I should like to have an explanation of the situation.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Illinois is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas for his request. I may say that the reason for such a study is to lay an objective basis to determine whether there are grounds for claims against the Government for damages suffered as the result of malnutrition in war prisoner camps. In the case of men who have been injured, wounded, or who are ill, as the Senator from Kansas knows, there is a medical record for the purpose which establishes a factual basis as to whether a claim is correct, but in the case of war prisoners, who are locked up by the enemy, there is, of course, no such record; and there is also the difficulty of determining whether the illness which the prisoner may later suffer is due to his imprisonment or to other causes. In other words, it is a very difficult problem to determine the degree of responsibility.

So this bill aims to lay a basis for a study, and it proposes that there shall be joint responsibility on the part of the War Claims Commission and the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs, but with the over-all coordinating responsibility

in the hands of the War Claims Commission rather than in the hands of the Veterans' Bureau. I suppose the question which the Senator from Kansas very properly raises is why the primary responsibility for supervising the study is placed upon the War Claims Commission.

First, it is because the War Claims Commission is the principal agency of the Government which is authorized to adjudicate claims of both former prisoners of war and former civilian internees.

Second, it has a special awareness of the many problems of the individual members of these groups through its contacts with them in the adjudication of their claims, and by virtue of the experience which it acquired in the course of its preparation of its report on war claims arising out of World War II.

Third, the group to be studied are most available to the War Claims Commission because it has in its files the names and addresses of thousands of former prisoners of war and former civilian internees. They would not be in danger of being lost in the crowd of much broader responsibilities which the Veterans' Administration carries.

Fourth, the group to be studied also includes civilian internees, including children, who are not subject to the jurisdiction of the Veterans' Administration.

Fifth, the Commission is actively interested in and desirous of making the study and has developed plans for doing so.

Sixth, this study can best be related by the War Claims Commission to the positive duty given it by Congress to make recommendations of further legislation as to categories and types of claims which should be received and considered and the legal and equitable bases therefor.

I point out that the War Claims Commission is not authorized and has definitely disclaimed any intention to set up a medical staff. It has given the assurance, which I now wish to make a part of the RECORD and make binding, that it will conclude the study well in advance of the date of the Commission's termination and will, therefore, not be used as an excuse to maintain in operation one more governmental commission.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I may say to the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois that he has covered some of the salient points to which I had serious objection. I am sure he feels that phase of the investigation would be better handled under the War Claims Commission.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Kansas.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall not object—I should like to add to what the distinguished senior Senator from Illinois has said in regard to the matter. I was the author of the War Claims Commission bill and conducted hearings throughout the United States on the question of prisoners of war, particularly those in Japan. We were faced with a very serious problem of what to do for those people. The Veterans' Administration acted fairly and liberally in interpreting permanent disability in individual cases, but the difficulty has been that 3 or 4 hundred of the men might be sent to one veterans' hospital, and others would be sent to some other hospital in another State, and there has been no coordinating study of the problem.

Some of the testimony was almost nauseating; it was terrible. All we have ever done for the prisoners of war has been to allow them, in the War Claims Commission, to receive only what the international prisoners of war agreement would allow each prisoner per day in the way of money, and that is only a dollar and some cents. Their mental condition is the big problem. When we look at them apparently there is nothing wrong with them, but I have found case after case where a man had been a prisoner of war in the Philippines under the Japanese occupation. He would get a job, but, for some reason, he could never hold it more than 30 days. These people go from job to job.

There is no way in which one can put his finger on just what is wrong, but all of these are cases which should be coordinated and looked into. In these cases there are serious problems of adjustment to civilian life, and I say that we have done nothing at all for those concerned in comparison with what I think we should do. I am glad to know that the bill is to be passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield?

Mr. MAGNUSON. I yield to the Senator from Tennessee.

Mr. McKELLAR. Of course I am in sympathy with doing what is fair and just to the men affected by this measure, but I wish to ask the Senator from Washington or the Senator from Illinois how much extra cost would be involved in setting up the additional institution necessary?

Mr. DOUGLAS. It would involve an expenditure of $75,000.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will state the amendments reported by the committee.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. On page 1, line 3, after the word "Commission", it is proposed to strike out "with the assistance and cooperation of" and insert "in cooperation with, and with the assistance of"; in line 5, after the word "Affairs", to insert "and the Federal Security Administrator"; in line 6, after the amendment just above stated, to strike out "shall inquire into and report to the Congress with respect to" and insert "within the limits of funds provided therefor, which appropriation is hereby authorized, are hereby authorized and directed to make all necessary arrangements for the conduct of medical and scientific research activities to determine"; on page 2, line 1, after the word "mortality", to strike out "rate" and insert "rates"; in line 6, after "World War II", to strike out "To this end the War Claims Commission is authorized and directed to make all necessary arrangements (including contracts, agreements, and so forth) for the conduct of research activities" and insert "The War Claims Commission shall report the findings resulting therefrom to the President for transmittal to the Congress. The results of such research activities shall, to the extent practicable, be used by the said agencies".

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the War Claims Commission, in cooperation with, and with the assistance of the Administrator of Veterans' Affairs and the Federal Security Administrator, within the limits of funds provided therefor, which appropriation is hereby authorized, are hereby authorized and directed to make all necessary arrangements for the conduct of medical and scientific research activities to determine the mortality rates and the mental and physical consequences of malnutrition and imprisonment sustained by members of the Armed Forces of the United States and civilian American citizens who were imprisoned by enemies of the United States during World War II. The War Claims Commission shall report the findings resulting therefrom to the President for transmittal to the Congress. The results of such research activities shall, to the extent practicable, be used by the said agencies for the purpose of determining—

(1) the procedures and standards to be applied in the diagnosis of the mental and physical condition of former prisoners of war;

(2) the life expectancy of former prisoners of war;

(3) whether there is evidence to sustain a conclusive presumption of service connection in favor of former prisoners of war for purposes of hospitalization in Veterans' Administration facilities; and

(4) standards to be applied, for the evaluation of claims of American civilian and military personnel based upon the physical and mental consequences of the conditions of their imprisonment, in the event such claims are later made compensable.

INVESTIGATIONS BY THE CIVIL SERVICE COMMISSION

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2077) to provide for certain investigations by the Civil Service Commission in lieu of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, and for other purposes.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, in the past I have objected to this bill. I have given the matter much thought and consideration. The subject was brought up before my subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations when it was recommended by Mr. J. Edgar Hoover, the head of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, that a bill of this kind should be passed.

Mr. President, I have grave doubt about this activity going over into the hands of the Civil Service Commission for investigation. I believe, however, that so much detail is involved in making investigations of small matters, that perhaps the FBI should be relieved of the burden.

I hope that whenever this activity is turned over to the Civil Service Commission it will be so administered as to insure a proper kind of investigation, even of small offices, small positions, and small affairs, which should not take up the time of the Federal Bureau of Investigation. I shall not object to the bill going through today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). The clerk will

state the amendments of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

The amendments were, on page 3, line 5, after the word "purposes", to strike out "section 114 of the act of June 5, 1950 (64 Stat. 198), entitled 'An act to provide foreign economic assistance';"; in line 10, after the word "purposes", to insert "and section 510 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951"; and on page 4, line 2, after the word "Commission", to insert a colon and the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 10 (b) (5) (B) (i) and (ii) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and section 510 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended by this act, a majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of Mutual Security, or the Secretary of State, as the case may be, shall certify those specific positions which are of a high degree of importance or sensitivity, and upon such certification the investigation and reports required by such provisions or by any other laws amended by the first section of this act shall, in the case of such positions, be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than the Civil Service Commission", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 10 (b) (5) (B) (i) and (B) (ii) of the act of August 1, 1946 (60 Stat. 755), entitled "An act for the development and control of atomic energy"; section 1 (2) of the act of May 22, 1947 (61 Stat. 103), entitled "An act to provide for assistance to Greece and Turkey"; section 1 of the joint resolution of May 31, 1947 (61 Stat. 125), entitled "Joint resolution providing for relief assistance to the people of countries devastated by war"; section 3 (e) of the act of August 5, 1947 (61 Stat. 780), entitled "An act to provide for the reincorporation of the Institute of Inter-American Affairs, and for other purposes"; section 1001 of the act of January 27, 1948 (62 Stat. 6), entitled "An act to promote the better understanding of the United States among the peoples of the world and to strengthen cooperative international relations"; section 110 (c) of the act of April 3, 1948 (62 Stat. 137), entitled "An act to promote world peace and the general welfare, national interest, and foreign policy of the United States through economic, financial, and other measures necessary to the maintenance of conditions abroad in which free institutions may survive and consistent with the maintenance of the strength and stability of the United States"; section 2 of the act of June 14, 1948 (62 Stat. 441), entitled "Joint resolution providing for membership and participation by the United States in the World Health Organization and authorizing an appropriation therefor"; section 3 of the act of June 30, 1948 (62 Stat. 1151), entitled "Joint resolution providing for acceptance by the United States of America of the Constitution of the International Labor Organization Instrument of Amendment, and further authorizing an appropriation for payment of the United States share of the expenses of membership and for expenses of participation by the United States"; subsection (c) of section 5 of the act of May 10, 1950 (64 Stat. 149), entitled "An act to promote the progress of science; to advance the national health, prosperity, and welfare; to secure the national defense; and for other purposes"; section 3 (e) of the act of August 11, 1950 (64 Stat. 438), entitled "An act to authorize the District of Columbia government to establish an Office of Civil Defense, and for other purposes"; and section 510 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, are amended by striking therefrom, wherever they appear, the words "Federal Bureau of Investigation" and inserting in lieu thereof the words "Civil Service Commission": *Provided*, That in the event an investigation made pursuant to any of the above statutes as herein amended develops any data reflecting that the individual who is the subject of the investigation is of questionable loyalty, the Civil Service Commission shall refer the matter to the Federal Bureau of Investigation for the conduct of a full field investigation, the results of which shall be furnished to the Civil Service Commission for its information and appropriate action: *Provided further*, That, if the President deems it to be in the national interest, he may from time to time cause investigations of any group or class which are required by any of the above statutes, to be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than the Civil Service Commission: *Provided further*, That notwithstanding the provisions of section 10 (b) (5) (B) (i) and (ii) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1946 and section 510 of the Mutual Security Act of 1951, as amended by this act, a majority of the members of the Atomic Energy Commission, the Director of Mutual Security, or the Secretary of State, as the case may be, shall certify those specific positions which are of a high degree of importance or sensitivity, and upon such certification the investigation and reports required by such provisions or by any other laws amended by the first section of this act shall, in the case of such positions, be made by the Federal Bureau of Investigation rather than the Civil Service Commission.

SEC. 2. The transfer of investigative functions hereinbefore provided for shall be effectuated during the period commencing with the date of the approval of this act and terminating 180 days thereafter, it being the intent of the Congress that the said transfer be effectuated as expeditiously within that period of time as the Civil Service Commission shall consider the facilities of that Commission adequate to undertake all or any part of the functions herein transferred: *Provided, however*, That investigations pending with the Federal Bureau of Investigation at the expiration of the 180 days shall be completed in due course by that Bureau and reports thereof furnished to the Civil Service Commission for its information and appropriate action.

SEC. 3. Nothing in this act shall be construed to affect in any way the responsibility of the Federal Bureau of Investigation for investigations of espionage, sabotage, or subversive acts.

SEC. 4. In order to carry out the provisions and purposes of this act, appropriations available to the departments or agencies, on whose account investigations are made pursuant to the statutes amended by section 1 of this act, shall be available for advances or reimbursements directly to the applicable appropriations of the Civil Service Commission, or of the Federal Bureau of Investigation, for the cost of investigations made for such departments or agencies.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I was present when the testimony regarding this bill was taken before the Committee on Appropriations, and I agree very fully that the bill should have been passed.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in addition to what the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations has said, I wish to state that I also was present when the testimony was taken. The bill came from the committee of which I am chairman. The FBI is simply unable to perform all the duties we ask them to assume in matters of small detail.

BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1117) for the creation of a Commission on Congressional Salaries and for other purposes was announced as next in order.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I do not believe this bill should be passed during the consideration of the Consent Calendar, and I ask that it go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 596) for the relief of the Alaska Juneau Gold Mining Co., of Juneau, Alaska, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request, I ask that this bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

MARK G. RUSHMANN

The bill (S. 430) for the relief of Mark G. Rushmann was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill, as amended, provides for payment of $7,093 to Mark G. Rushmann, of Chippewa Falls, Wis., as compensation for personal injuries sustained by him at the Madison, Wis., railroad station on December 22, 1945, approximately 1½ hours after his discharge from the United States Navy, before he was able to reach his home from the separation center at Great Lakes, Ill. While claimant was awaiting arrival of his train, which was several hours late, he was pushed by a person or persons unknown, lost his footing on the ice or hard-packed snow, and fell beneath a moving train, seriously injuring his right leg, which required hospitalization for 4 months. The Veterans' Administration has evaluated his injuries as 30-percent permanent disability, but held he was not entitled to compensation therefor by reason of such injury occurring 1½ hours subsequent to his discharge. The committee felt that the decision of the Veterans' Administration was harsh, though correct, in its inability to give due weight to the equities of the case. While it has been the custom to allow veterans sufficient time after their release from active duty to permit them to reach their homes while yet technically in the service, this claimant was unable to reach his home because of the delay of the train. The basis for opposition by Veterans' Administration to a prior similar bill has been removed. This bill proposes to grant a sum certain, actually based upon the present worth of future pension payments, less the amount collected by claimant from the railroad, $5,500, if such pension payment were not barred by naval regulations and Judge Advocate General rulings.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator from Nevada yield?

Mr. McCARRAN. Certainly.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Does the Senator from Nevada know of any definite or direct precedent which might be cited for the payment of the claim in view of this man's separation from the service before the injury occurred?

Mr. McCARRAN. The case is unique, so far as I know. There is no precedent upon which it rests. It may establish a precedent.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. The Senator thinks it may establish a precedent, does he?

Mr. McCARRAN. I would not say so positively, but it may. The accident did occur 1½ hours after the serviceman was discharged, but there were certain attendant conditions which the committee decided raised an equity in his favor.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, the Senator from Kansas and other Senators who have been checking this measure desire to be absolutely fair to the individual who is involved, but the establishment of a precedent by allowing a claim arising after separation from the service, as happened in this case, might tend to open the door to so many analogous cases which might develop that, frankly, the Senator from Kansas feels that while not allowing this bill to pass might work an injustice, the injustices which would follow the establishment of such a precedent would be so far-reaching and so all-encompassing that it would be dangerous indeed.

I might say to the distinguished Senator from Nevada that if there could be established some kind of a definite, positive basis for cut-offs, the Senator from Kansas would not have objection.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am delighted to have the Senator do so.

Mr. McCARRAN. In the judgment of the chairman of the committee—and I think I may say in the judgment of the committee—this case would not constitute such a precedent as would cause the committee to follow it in the future. There were certain contingent conditions which arose in this case—the delayed train, and the unusual jostling of this man, throwing him under the train as it approached. All those things entered into our consideration when we agreed to grant the award. But the question would not arise again, perhaps, in any case. It is doubtful whether it would ever arise again. That is the reason I submit the case.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Therefore the distinguished Senator from Nevada would agree that if by reason of these unusual incidents this case could be pinpointed as an exceptional case which would not involve the establishment of a precedent, the award should, in equity and good conscience, be granted?

Mr. McCARRAN. The establishment of a precedent was the thing uppermost in the minds of members of the committee in studying this case. I say that I do not regard this case as establishing a precedent. There are conditions in this case which are unique, and which would not be found again in 10,000 cases.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I withdraw my objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, how long after the man's discharge from the Army did this accident occur?

Mr. McCARRAN. One and a half hours.

Mr. McKELLAR. Was he on his way home?

Mr. McCARRAN. He was on his way home.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CLEMENTS in the chair). Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 430) for the relief of Mark G. Rushmann, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary, with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$12,593" and insert "$7,093", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mark G. Rushmann, of 502 South Main Street, Chippewa Falls, Wis., the sum of $7,093 as compensation for personal injuries sustained by him at the Madison, Wis., railroad station on December 22, 1945, the day following the date of his discharge from the United States Navy: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this Act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 337) to amend the Public Health Service Act and the Vocational Education Act of 1946 to provide an emergency 5-year program of grants and scholarships for education in the fields of medicine, osteopathy, dentistry, dental hygiene, public health, and nursing professions, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, by request I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

ACQUISITION BY INTERIOR DEPARTMENT OF GILA PUEBLO, GLOBE COUNTY, ARIZ.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2169) authorizing the acquisition by the Secretary of the Interior of the Gila Pueblo, in Globe County, Ariz., for archeological laboratory and storage purposes, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "property", to strike out "in" and insert "near", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior is authorized to acquire for archaeological laboratory and storage purposes, and for general monument uses in connection with the National monuments of the Southwest, the property near Globe, Ariz., known as the Gila Pueblo. For such acquisition, and expenses incidental thereto, there is authorized to be appropriated not to exceed $75,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill authorizing the acquisition by the Secretary of the Interior of the Gila Pueblo, in Gila County, Ariz., for archaeological laboratory and storage purposes, and for other purposes."

SUSPENSION OF IMPORT DUTIES ON LEAD AND ZINC—BILLS PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 4948) to suspend certain import duties on lead was announced as next in order.

Mr. MALONE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (H. R. 5448) to provide for the temporary free importation of zinc was announced as next in order.

Mr. MALONE. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I wonder if we might have an agreement as to the time when these bills may be considered. I understand that the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] has been very anxious to have them acted upon. I think perhaps we could temporarily lay aside the unfinished business either tomorrow or Monday and take them up for consideration.

Mr. GEORGE. It would be quite agreeable to me. The Defense Department insists that these bills should be passed. They are most important to the defense program. I shall be glad to take them up tomorrow or Monday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Would the Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE] have any objection to temporarily laying aside the unfinished business and taking up these bills tomorrow?

Mr. MALONE. I defer to the senior Senator from Nevada for a statement.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I do not know when I would care to take them up. I do not want them deferred because of my present condition. If they could go over for a couple of weeks, it would be helpful to me, but I will not ask that they be deferred on my account. I hope it may be possible to have the bills go over for a few days.

Mr. McFARLAND. I shall not make the request today, under those circumstances. I will let the Senator from Georgia confer with the Senator from Nevada.

INCREASE IN LIMIT OF EXPENDITURES BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON SMALL BUSINESS

The resolution (S. Res. 238) increasing the limit of expenditures by the Select Committee on Small Business was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the Select Committee on Small Business is authorized to expend from

the contingent fund of the Senate the sum of $35,000 for the purpose of discharging obligations incurred by it after November 30, 1951, and prior to July 1, 1952, in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by Senate Resolution 58, Eighty-first Congress. Such sum shall be in addition to any other moneys available to the committee for such purpose, and shall be disbursed upon vouchers approved by the chairman.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY TO INVESTIGATE RELATIONSHIP OF THE UNITED STATES WITH INDIANS

The resolution (S. Res. 241) extending the authority for an investigation of the relationship of the United States with the Indians was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, may we have an explanation of the resolution, especially with reference to any reports which may have been made by the committee while it has been functioning?

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, the resolution carries no additional money. There is an unexpended balance remaining from the money made available to the committee last year. There is a balance on hand of $6,864. The committee is asking that that amount remain available during this year. The money has been used to carry on investigations of matters wholly within the jurisdiction of the committee, as provided by the rules. There has been no special work, in other words, above and beyond the customary work of the committee. However, the Indian reservations cover 110 jurisdictions. If a situation arises somewhere into which the committee wishes to inquire, it would like to have a little money for travel.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under S. Res. 292, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to July 13, 1950, and as extended by S. Res. 32, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 29, 1951, and as further extended by S. Res. 152, Eight-second Congress, agreed to June 29, 1951 (to investigate the relations of the United States with the Indians and Indian tribes), is hereby continued through January 31, 1953.

EXTENSION OF AUTHORITY FOR INVESTIGATION OF FUEL RESERVES AND FORMULATION OF A FUEL POLICY FOR THE UNITED STATES

The resolution (S. Res. 242) extending the authority for the investigation of the fuel reserves and to formulate a fuel policy for the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, I assume the same situation applies to this resolution as applied to the previous calendar number.

Mr. HAYDEN. Mr. President, we allowed the committee $25,000 last year, and there is a balance of $14,912 remaining.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. As I understand, the extension of the authority is necessary by reason of the fact that the committee has not been able to complete its work.

Mr. HAYDEN. That is correct.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I have no objection.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, as I understand there will be no request for additional appropriations.

Mr. HAYDEN. Not at all. I am sure of that.

Mr. McKELLAR. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

There being no objection, the resolution was considered and agreed to, as follows:

Resolved, That the authority of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, under S. Res. 239, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to August 15, 1950, and as extended by S. Res. 374, Eighty-first Congress, agreed to December 21, 1950, and as extended by S. Res. 33, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to January 29, 1951, and as further extended by S. Res. 153, Eighty-second Congress, agreed to June 29, 1951 (providing for a study and investigation of the fuel reserves and to formulate a fuel policy of the United States), is hereby continued through January 31, 1953.

BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (H. R. 5097) to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, may we have an explanation of this bill? If not, I ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENTS, BADLANDS NATIONAL MONUMENT, S. DAK.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3540) to provide for boundary adjustments of the Badlands National Monument, in the State of South Dakota, and for other purposes, which had been reported from the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs with amendments on page 3, line 3, after the word "discretion", to insert "and in accordance with the provisions of section 355 of the Revised Statutes"; and on page 4, after line 4, to strike out:

SEC. 5. Not to exceed four thousand acres of the Pine Ridge Indian Reservation in the Sheep Mountain area thereof adjacent to the monument may be included within the national monument by one of the following methods subject to the approval of any Federal agency holding leases with respect to such lands: (a) With the consent of the tribal council of the Oglala Sioux Tribe of Indians of the Pine Ridge Reservation, State of South Dakota, and on such terms and conditions as are mutually satisfactory to the said tribal council and to the Secretary of the Interior; or (b) with the consent of the said tribal council, through the conveyance by the Secretary of the Interior to the said Oglala Sioux Tribe of Indians of private lands within the said Indian reservation, which he is hereby authorized to acquire in such manner and through such agency of the Department of the Interior as he may deem advisable, in exchange for tribal lands of approximately equal value within the area authorized to be included in this section within the national monument. The Secretary is authorized to execute such deeds or other instruments as may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

GREGORIO BRILOVICH

The bill (S. 1361) a bill for the relief of Gregorio Brilovich was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Gregorio Brilovich shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

YOSHIYUKI MAYESHIRO

The bill (S. 1426) for the relief of Yoshiyuki Mayeshiro was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, notwithstanding the provisions of section 13 (c) of the Immigration Act of 1924, as amended (U. S. C., title 8, sec. 213 (c)), Yoshiyuki Mayeshiro, a minor, may be admitted to the United States for permanent residence if he is found to be otherwise admissible under the provisions of the immigration laws.

JOHN TZANAVARIS

The bill (S. 1428) for the relief of John Tzanavaris was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien John Tzanavaris shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

TITUS RADULESCO-POGONEANO

The bill (S. 1781) for the relief of Titus Radulesco-Pogoneano was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third

reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Titus Radulesco-Pogoneano shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

MRS. DESPINA HODOS

The bill (S. 1782) for the relief of Mrs. Despina Hodos was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Mrs. Despina Hodos shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

SUSPENSION OF STATUTE OF LIMITATIONS WITH RESPECT TO CERTAIN OFFENSES BY GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 1811) to suspend the running of the statutes of limitations applicable to offenses involving performance of official duties by Government officers and employees during periods of Government service of the officer or employee concerned was announced as next in order.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. Mr. President, it is the judgment of the junior Senator from New Jersey that this is an excellent piece of legislation. However, it is a departure from established policy, and I think the RECORD should show a careful explanation of the bill.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, this bill would suspend the running of the statutes of limitations applicable to offenses involving performance of official duties by Government officers and employees during periods of Government service of the officer or employee concerned.

The effect of this bill would be to extend the period during which certain types of offenses could be prosecuted. It would be applicable to Government officers and employees who commit the specified offense and to those persons who attempt or offer to procure a commission of such offenses. In such instances, the bill would suspend the running of the statute while the Government officer or employee is in the public service.

The committee believes that enactment of this bill would serve a most useful purpose by way of holding Government officers and employees accountable for their actions during public service.

The committee, therefore, recommends that this bill, S. 1811, be favorably considered.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, I should like to have some time to study the bill. This is the first knowledge I have had of it. Of course, it is my fault; I simply have not had time to check all the bills on the calendar. Offhand, it strikes me that the bill deals with a principle which should be very carefully considered. It is the principle of whether we are to have equality of justice before the law for all Americans. The purpose of a statute of limitations remains the same whether there is involved a Government employee or a private citizen. The justification for the existence of a statute of limitations, in the first place, Mr. President, remains the same irrespective of the person to whom it is to be applied.

Among the various purposes of a statute of limitations is the recognition that after the passage of time it becomes very difficult for people accused of crime to make available evidence which is needed in their behalf and to have available the witnesses who can testify in support of their innocence.

Offhand, Mr. President, I would have a little difficulty in understanding why a distinction should be drawn so far as guaranteeing those protections are concerned, as between Government employees and private citizens. Without committing myself as to any final objection to the bill, because after further study I may be convinced that it can be justified, but because I believe we must always be very careful to safeguard American citizens, so far as the operation of criminal laws is concerned, by seeing to it that the presumption of innocence has real meaning, and that they may have ample opportunity to protect themselves and not be called upon to try to establish evidence which will show their innocence long after a reasonable time has elapsed, and because I believe it is also important that the enforcement agencies of the Government keep on the job constantly and not be encouraged in any form of laxity on their part, I respectfully say to the able chairman of the Judiciary Committee that I should like to have some time between now and the next call of the calendar to study the bill further.

Therefore, only for the purpose of postponement, and not for the purpose of final objection, I do raise objection today.

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, while the Senator from Oregon is considering the bill—and I am very glad to have him consider it—I would ask him to please consider an instance in which someone in the Department of Justice—and I use the Department of Justice only by way of illustration—so maneuvers matters that no indictment is brought against himself until the statute of limitations has run, and then leaves the Department of Justice. I used the Department of Justice, as I have said, only as an illustration. The bill is not pointed at officers or employees in the Government service.

Mr. MORSE. I have no doubt, Mr. President, that there are instances in which the existence of the statute of limitations cheats or prevents the doing of justice. On the other hand, I am satisfied that, by and large, a statute of limitations in respect of criminal prosecutions is necessary, first, to protect the innocent, and, second, to make perfectly clear to the enforcement arms of the Government that they ought to proceed quickly with prosecutions and not let them lag until so much time has elapsed that persons charged with crime cannot come forward with evidence necessary to protect themselves properly.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard. The bill will go over.

J. HIBBS BUCKMAN AND A. RAYMOND RAFF, JR., EXECUTORS

The bill (S. 1998) for the relief of J. Hibbs Buckman and A. Raymond Raff, Jr., executors of the estate of A. Raymond Raff, deceased, was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to J. Hibbs Buckman and A. Raymond Raff, Jr., executors under the will of A. Raymond Raff, deceased, the sum of $2,217.86. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the National City Bank of New York, N. Y., and Banco da Madeira, Funchal, Madeira, and their agents, successors, or correspondents against the United States, the Indemnity Insurance Co. of North America as surety on the bond of A. Raymond Raff, deceased, formerly collector of customs at the port of Philadelphia, Pa., and the estate of the said A. Raymond Raff for loss caused by the unlawful sale on July 17, 1947, of two cases of handkerchiefs consigned to the National City Bank of New York, N. Y., which were sold as unclaimed merchandise before the expiration of the general-order period, as extended: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or recovered by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any provision of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MR. AND MRS. DAVID H. PERKINS

The bill (S. 2004) for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. David H. Perkins was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $10,000, to Mr. and Mrs. David H. Perkins, of Montpelier, Idaho, in full satisfaction of their claim against the United States for compensation for the death of their son, Carlos M. Perkins, who was killed in the Philippine Islands on December 14, 1941, while destroying dynamite, gasoline, oil, and other supplies to prevent them from falling into the hands of the enemy: *Provided*, That no part

of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

PAYMENT OF CERTAIN CLAIMS FOR DAMAGE TO PRIVATE PROPERTY RESULTING FROM ARMY ACTIVITIES

The bill (S. 2157) to authorize payment of certain claims for damage to private property arising from activities of the Army was considered, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John L. Bauer, Watertown, N. Y., $50; to Ernest Bohna, Brogan, Oreg., $50; and to William E. Dollar, Meigs, Ga., $98.50. The payment of said sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of the above-named claimants against the United States for damage to their property caused by military personnel or civilian employees of the Army, or otherwise incident to noncombat activities of the Army, and determined by the Department of the Army to be meritorious, which are not payable under any existing statute available for the settlement of claims against the United States: *Provided*, That no part of the amounts appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent of any claim shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with such claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating any of the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

MRS. PAULINE J. GOURDEAUX

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 858) for the relief of Mrs. Pauline J. Gourdeaux, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$1,000" and insert "$1,252.20", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Pauline J. Gourdeaux, of Denver, Colo., the sum of $1,252.20, representing the amount of pension she would have received for the period beginning on January 28, 1945, and ending on April 10, 1947, had her claim for a dependent parent's pension been filed within 1 year after January 28, 1945, the date fixed by the War Department as the date of death of Pfc Edward E. Gourdeaux: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EMELIE SIMHA

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1226) for the relief of Emelie Simha, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 1, after the word "available", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That there be given a suitable bond or undertaking approved by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, as a guaranty against the said Emelie Simha becoming institutionalized at public expense or otherwise becoming a public charge", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, the alien Emelie Simha shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available: *Provided*, That there be given a suitable bond or undertaking approved by the Commissioner of Immigration and Naturalization, in such amount and containing such conditions as he may prescribe, as a guaranty against the said Emelie Simha becoming institutionalized at public expense or otherwise becoming a public charge.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JOE W. WIMBERLY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1458) for the relief of Joe W. Wimberly which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$3,389.28" and insert "$3,400", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Joe W. Wimberly, of Kingsport, Tennessee, the sum of $3,400, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for medical, nursing, hospital, and other expenses incurred by him as a result of an automobile accident which occurred near Franklin, Georgia, on April 28, 1950, while he was returning to Kingsport from a training conference at Fort Benning, Ga., in connection with his duties as commanding officer, Six Hundred and Thirty-ninth Transportation Heavy Truck Company: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

GORDON E. SMITH

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1749) for the relief of Gordon E. Smith which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 2, line 8, after the word "duty", to insert a colon and the following proviso: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That (a) Gordon E. Smith is hereby relieved of all liability to repay to the United States such sums (amounting in the aggregate to approximately $1,006.25) as were received by him as additional pay for duty requiring aerial flights, pursuant to the Pay Readjustment Act of 1942, as amended, on account of flight duty performed by him in the months of March through September 1946, as a Sanitarian, United States Public Health Service, while assigned to duty with the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration in Greece.

(b) The Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the said Gordon E. Smith the sum of $143.75, which sum was repaid by him to the United States under protest pursuant to a decision of the Comptroller General (B-90700, January 13, 1950) disallowing payment of such additional pay to the said Gordon E. Smith for such duty: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROBERT JOSEPH VETTER

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2100) for the relief of Robert Joseph Vetter, which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$10,000" and insert "$158", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to

pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Robert Joseph Vetter, of Miami, Fla., the sum of $158. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Robert Joseph Vetter against the United States on account of personal injuries, medical and hospital expenses, and loss of earnings sustained by him as a result of his rescue of two United States Navy fliers who were fatally injured in the crash of a Navy airplane approximately 50 yards north of the recreation pier at the south end of Miami Beach, Fla., on June 5, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HARRIET F. BRADSHAW

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (S. 2005) for the relief of Harriet F. Bradshaw which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments on page 1, line 7, after the word "injuries", to insert "property damage and medical expenses"; and in line 10, after the word "riding", to strike out "in" and insert "on", so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Harriet F. Bradshaw, the sum of $5,000, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for compensation for personal injuries, property damage and medical expenses, sustained by her as the result of a motor vehicle accident involving an Army truck in which she was riding on Frankfurterstrasse, Wiesbaden, Germany, on July 6, 1947: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding $1,000.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTON BERNHARD BLIKSTAD

The bill (H. R. 870) for the relief of Anton Bernhard Blikstad was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ZBIGNIEW JAN DUNIKOWSKI ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 961) for the relief of Zbigniew Jan Dunikowski, Karolina Dunikowski, Wanda Octavia Dunikowski, and Janina Grospera Dunikowski was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD C. BRUNETT

The bill (H. R. 1131) for the relief of Edward C. Brunett was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JURISDICTION IN CLAIM OF BERNARD R. NOVAK

The bill (H. R. 1964) to confer jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Central Division of the Southern District of California to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of Bernard R. Novak was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

JEREMIAH COLEMAN

The bill (H. R. 2072) for the relief of Jeremiah Coleman was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

CARL WEITLANNER

The bill (H. R. 2505) for the relief of Carl Weitlanner was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SOR MATILDE SOTELO FERNANDEZ ET AL.

The bill (H. R. 2589) for the relief of Sor Matilde Sotelo Fernandez, Sor Virtudes Garcia Garcia, and Sor Amalia Gonzalez Gonzalez was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. THELMA A. NOLEN

The bill (H. R. 2662) for the relief of Mrs. Thelma A. Nolen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ANTONIO CORRAO CORP.

The bill (H. R. 3006) for the relief of Antonio Corrao Corp. was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

O. L. OSTEEN

The bill (H. R. 3137) for the relief of O. L. Osteen was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MASTER SGT. ORVAL BENNETT

The bill (H. R. 3946) for the relief of Master Sgt. Orval Bennett was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MRS. LORENE M. WILLIAMS

The bill (H. R. 4228) for the relief of Mrs. Lorene M. Williams was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ALLEN W. SPANGLER

The bill (H. R. 4318) for the relief of Allen W. Spangler was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

MARK PAUL CROWLEY

The bill (H. R. 4671) for the relief of Mark Paul Crowley was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRANCESCO FRATALIA

The bill (H. R. 4876) for the relief of Francesco Fratalia was considered, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

ROSARIO GARCIA JIMENO

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 1469) for the relief of Rosario Garcia Jimeno which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment to strike out all after the enacting clause and insert:

That, for the purposes of the immigration and naturalization laws, Rosario Garcia Jimeno shall be held and considered to have been lawfully admitted to the United States for permanent residence as of the date of the enactment of this act, upon payment of the required visa fee and head tax. Upon the granting of permanent residence to such alien as provided for in this act, the Secretary of State shall instruct the proper quota-control officer to deduct one number from the appropriate quota for the first year that such quota is available.

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

WILLIAM C. REED

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2858) for the relief of William C. Reed which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment on page 1, line 6, after the word "of", to strike out "$5,-710.20" and insert "$4,810.20."

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

JURISDICTION IN CLAIMS OF WILLIAM P. NOVOTNY, SR.

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 2212) conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Southern District of New York to determine the claims of William P. Novotny, Sr., and others which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 3, after the word "upon", to strike out "the" and insert "a"; in line 4, after the word "Court", to strike out "for the Southern District of New York"; on page 2, line 8, after the word "That", to strike out "the exception set forth in section 2680 (a), title 28, United States Code, shall not apply to the action authorized under this act" and insert "this suit is instituted in the United States District Court for the district wherein the plaintiffs are resident or wherein the act complained of occurred."

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title was amended, so as to read: "An act conferring jurisdiction upon a United States district court to determine the claims of William P. Novotny, Sr., and others."

GLADYS J. McCARTHY

The Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 4953) for the relief of Gladys J. McCarthy which had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the words "sum of", to strike out "$5,000" and insert "$125"; and in line 8, after the words "for the", to strike out "loss of an established business and for all losses of personal and business effects suffered as a result of her forced evacuation by Government officials from the Territory of Hawaii, which evacuation was unauthorized and unlawful since she was a domiciliary of Hawaii and as such was not comprehended within the Secretary of Navy's evacuation order" and insert "cost of transportation from Honolulu to San Francisco, California, in May 1942".

The amendments were agreed to.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

CHIEF COUNSEL FOR COMMITTEE ON THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—JOINT RESOLUTION PASSED OVER

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 123) to authorize the employment of a chief counsel at a salary not to exceed $15,000 per annum, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I ask that the joint resolution be passed over.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas withhold his objection until an explanation is made?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Yes; I am glad to withhold the objection.

Mr. HUNT. Mr. President, I am not chairman of either the committee or the subcommittee. However, the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY] is unable to be here at this time, and has asked me to make a brief explanation of the joint resolution.

When the chief counsel was employed by the Committee on the District of Columbia, a salary of $15,000 was tentatively agreed to, as I understand. However, subsequent to that time we ascertained from the law that a special enactment would be required in order to make it possible to pay such a salary; as I remember, the present law provides that not in excess of $12,000 can be paid, except by means of an act of Congress. That is why provision for the payment of a salary of $17,500 was written into the resolution relating to the Kefauver committee, in order to permit the payment of that salary to its chief counsel.

Only yesterday the Committee on Rules and Administration took such action that I think the work of the special crime subcommittee of the Committee on the District of Columbia will be quickly terminated and brought to an end, with the result that the amount of money involved in this matter will necessarily be a very small one.

I may say that the chief counsel has proved to be extremely able, and I think the amount proposed as payment for his services is really very fair.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, let me ask the Senator from Wyoming how much money, in dollars, is involved in this matter.

Mr. HUNT. I cannot tell the Senator from Tennessee exactly how much is involved; it will be the difference for only a few months between a salary of $12,000, as provided by the Reorganization Act, and a salary of $15,000, as provided in this joint resolution. I estimate that perhaps not more than $8,000, or some such amount, will be involved.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, will the Senator from Wyoming be willing to let this measure go over until the next call of the calendar? There may be good reason for the enactment of the joint resolution, but I should like very much to be able to look into it.

Mr. HUNT. Of Course, Mr. President, I shall not object to the course the Senator suggests. However, by the time of the next call of the calendar, the counsel may not be in the employ of the committee; he may have returned to his office in New York City. That is why we are attempting to have the joint resolution passed today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Kansas withdraw his objection?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I regret that because of the absence from the floor and probably from the session today of some of the Senators who are in very serious doubt about this matter, I cannot withdraw the objection.

However, I can say to the distinguished Senator from Wyoming that in all probability some of the matters objected to may be clarified before the next call of the calendar, so that this matter may be taken care of by that means or else may be expedited in some other manner.

Mr. HUNT. I thank the distinguished Senator.

For the RECORD, Mr. President, let me say that I failed to state that the joint resolution comes to the Senate by the unanimous vote of the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the joint resolution will be passed over.

PRODUCTION OF WATER FOR AGRICULTURAL AND OTHER USES—BILL PASSED OVER

The bill (S. 5) to provide for research into and demonstration of practical means for the economic production from sea or other saline waters, or from the atmosphere (including cloud formations), of water suitable for agricultural, industrial, municipal, and other beneficial consumptive uses, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, reserving the right to object—and I shall object, because this bill is most far-reaching and involves a most important matter—let me say very frankly that I do not think this measure is of the type of those which should be passed during the call of the calendar.

So far as this particular bill is concerned, it has so many interesting phases, affecting so many areas of the country, so many people, and so many activities, that I would not want to see the bill passed during the call of the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas withhold his objection for a moment?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I am glad to do so.

Mr. ANDERSON. Let me say that this bill is one in which the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY] was very much interested a year or so ago. We held hearings on the bill.

The reason why I hope there will not be objection to the bill now is that in connection with the hearings on rain-making, representatives of one of the great foundations in the United States came to me and expressed their interest in the subject of making from sea water, water which could be used for irrigation or for industrial purposes.

If the Senate will pass this bill, I think the Department of the Interior will be able to make with private organizations arrangements by means of which a great deal of the money will be forthcoming. That is why the amount of Government money proposed for expenditure in connection with the bill has been substantially reduced.

I can assure the Senator that there is a great possibility of solving, by means of this route, some of the water problems of the West, which otherwise might be solved by methods which would prove more expensive than by the use of sea water.

So I hope the bill will be passed.

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. Mr. President, I understand that there are under way certain experiments which I hope may be developed. However, there are so many features of the bill which affect certain areas of the country that I can understand why some of the persons who have spoken to those of us on the calendar committee desire to have the bill go over; and I think it should go over until the next call of the calendar, so that we may have an opportunity to go into some of the phases of the matter about which the distinguished Senator from New Mexico has just spoken.

Mr. ANDERSON. I wish to say that all the rain-making features of the bill have been completely eliminated from it; the bill does not now deal at all with rain making. The bill deals only with the development of research and the

testing on a pilot-plant scale of facilities for the use of sea water in the making of potable water.

For example, recently a scientist in Sweden has developed a new method which promises to be possibly 2 percent as expensive as the present methods, which are rather expensive. We have tried to find some way of testing that method, but there is no provision by which it can be tested.

Representatives of the research organization headed by Fairfield Osborne came to me and said they would appreciate having an opportunity to work on that matter in Government channels, and that their organization would provide most of the money for it.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kansas yield to me?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I notice that the Senator from New Mexico is keenly interested in research into the methods of rain making. Is it possible that the Senator from Kansas is even more keenly interested in research into some method of rain stopping?

Mr. SCHOEPPEL. I may say to the distinguished Senator from Vermont that only last year hundreds of thousands of persons in my section of the country would have been most happy to have found some method of stopping rain.

Mr. President, in all seriousness I wish to say to the distinguished Senators that I am in sympathy with certain phases of the proposed research. I want no misunderstanding about that, for I think it is most commendable.

I have no reason to dispute the statement the Senator from New Mexico has made. However, there are certain other phases of the matter which cause me to feel compelled to object at this time to the present consideration of the bill.

I shall be glad to discuss this matter with the distinguished Senator from New Mexico, so that he will be able to get in contact with the Senators who are not now in the Chamber, but who have lodged objection to this measure.

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, my very dear friend, the Senator from Kansas, recognizes, I know, that I am always happy to yield in a case of this sort. However, I should like to know the names of the Senators who have objected, because I am confident that they are mistaken in regard to the purport and effect of the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection having been heard, the bill is passed over.

CONVEYANCE OF BEAR LAKE FISH-CULTURAL STATION TO UTAH FISH AND GAME COMMISSION

The bill (H. R. 3368) providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake Fish-Cultural Station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah was announced as next in order.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, reserving the right to object, this bill was reported by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce on January 23. It involves the gratis transfer of 17.76 acres and fish-hatchery facilities, the combined value of which is estimated by the Interior Department to be $10,000.

The bill provides that the Secretary of the Interior, in making the transfer, may include in the conveyance such conditions as he may deem necessary for the purpose of protecting the interests of the United States. No other reversionary clause or other restriction is included.

A call to the Interior Department elicited the information that no effective efforts have been made to determine whether any other Federal Government use is possible, although it is probably logical to assume that, due to the nature and placement of the property, no other Federal Government agency could use it. More importantly, it was also indicated that no survey had been made as to alternatives other than a free transfer, such as a continuation of the present cooperative agreement of lease with the State paying repair costs, or the payment of 50 percent of the fair market value.

Mr. President, this brings up once again the whole question as to whether we are going to give away Federal surplus property or whether we are going to try to protect all the taxpayers of the United States by requiring the various States, counties, and municipalities which are trying to obtain Federal property for nothing to pay at least a fair sum for such property, such as 50 percent of the appraised fair market value.

In the last session of Congress my views on this subject suffered some battering because of various techniques which circumvented the Morse amendment but that does not in the slightest cool off my ardor to do what I can to protect all the taxpayers from a give-away program involving Federal property. With a budget proposed of more than $85,000,000,000, we in the Congress had better save every red cent we can for all the taxpayers.

In this bill there is involved a fish hatchery and, so far as I can tell, the bill is identical with a bill introduced some 2 or 3 years ago seeking to transfer without cost or payment a Federal fish hatchery to the University of Minnesota. At that time we prevailed upon the sponsors of the bill to accept a provision that 50 percent of the appraised fair market value should be paid for that fish hatchery. So long as the junior Senator from Oregon remains in the Senate this bill will never go through the Senate on the unanimous-consent calendar without provision being made for the payment of 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the property.

So far as the junior Senator from Oregon and other Senators are concerned, we are going to do the best we can in this session of the Congress to save the taxpayers some money; we are going to try at least to get the Federal budget down to not more than $70,000,000,000. So, I think we had better start here with this little $10,000 item by saying to the State of Utah that it had better come across with $5,000, half of the appraised fair market value of this property.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I withhold my objection until I hear from my friend, the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I thank the Senator from Oregon for yielding to me. I desire to point out to him, in addition to the facts to which he has called attention, that both the States and the Federal Government are engaged in the culture of fish. Perhaps neither of them ought to be in that business; I do not know whether they should or not; but both the States and the Federal Government are in it.

Here we have a property which was built by the WPA at a total cost to the Federal Government of $10,000. The 17 acres of land was a gift to the Government of the United States, so the total cost to the Federal Government is approximately $10,000, which was paid 16 years ago.

The situation is this: After this fish hatchery was built it was discovered that fish could not be raised there because there was too much nitrogen in the water; but the State of Utah can use the fish hatchery for the purpose of hatching fish, and the fish can then be transferred to another State fish hatchery, which is available, the Logan hatchery, so-called, where the fish can be raised. That is what they want to do. In other words, this present facility is absolutely and completely worthless, unless it is used in connection with another plant, to which immediately after the fish were hatched from the roe, they could be transferred, to be raised in the ponds there.

I am sorry to have taken so much time to make the very simple point that both units of government are engaged in the culture of fish, both are doing the same thing; and if the Utah hatchery will engage in the culture of fish, it will save the United States Government that much of an outlay. So, if we turn this hatchery over to the State of Utah, instead of losing money, the Federal Government will be gaining money.

I commend the Senator from Oregon for adherence to the rule he has followed against merely turning over Federal property to the States willy-nilly without a careful consideration of the equities involved. I think he is entitled to a great deal of commendation on the part of the Congress of the United States for standing for that principle; but I have never yet seen a rule worth being designated as a rule to which there should not be exceptions. I maintain that this is an instance where an exception to the Senator's rule should be made, and I hope that he will consider it in that light.

I know the Senator from Oregon will stand fast by this rule without my expressing any hope or commendation in regard to it, because he is very firm in his convictions; but I urge him to try to save a little money for Uncle Sam by letting the States perform functions which they are willing to assume, as Utah will be permitted to do, if he will

let this transfer, involving these few dollars, go through.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my good friend from Colorado is one of the most effective watchdogs over the Treasury in the United States Senate, but I am afraid his argument today shows that there are exceptions to constant vigilance on the part of Members of the Senate, because I think he is letting down on his watchfulness in regard to this bill. His argument really reduces itself to this: Utah has a fish-hatchery program, the Federal Government has a fish-hatchery program; therefore we ought to help Utah with its fish-hatchery program by turning over to Utah, without payment of any kind, a $10,000 facility.

Mr. President, most of the States have fish-hatchery programs. Their State budgets include sums and appropriations for financing fish-hatchery programs. All I am asking Utah to do is to pay for its own fish-hatchery program and not ask all the taxpayers of the United States to donate to the State of Utah $10,000 with which to carry on that program. In fact, I think I am exceedingly lenient when I insist that there be applied in this case the Morse formula, which is 50 percent of the appraised fair market value. I think there is a national interest in it to that extent, but not to more than that exent; and therefore, without such an amendment, I shall object to the bill; and I do object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will go over.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado subsequently said: Mr. President, if I may have the attention of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE], I should like to ask him if he has prepared the amendment which he has in mind offering to House bill 3368, Calendar No. 1044?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I have a standard amendment, which is that there be inserted in the bill at the appropriate place the condition that the State of Utah shall pay 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the property.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, I ask that the Senate return to the consideration of Calendar No. 1044, House bill 3368.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 3368) providing for the conveyance of the Bear Lake fish cultural station to the Fish and Game Commission of the State of Utah.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, my amendment is that there be inserted in the bill, on page 1, line 4, after the words "subject to" the words "the condition that the State of Utah shall pay 50 percent of the appraised fair market value of the property and to."

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I shall not resist the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon [Mr. MORSE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The amendment was ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, will the Senator from New Jersey withhold that suggestion for a moment?

Mr. HENDRICKSON. I withhold the suggestion.

AMENDATORY REPAYMENT CONTRACTS UNDER RECLAMATION LAWS

Mr. ANDERSON. Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to return to Calendar 1004, House bill 5097, to extend the time during which the Secretary of the Interior may enter into amendatory repayment contracts under the Federal reclamation laws, and for other purposes.

The consideration of that bill was objected to a little while ago.

Mr. HENDRICKSON. The Senator who objected is now off the floor.

Mr. ANDERSON. No; he is on the floor.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, all I asked for was an explanation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, I am constrained to object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is heard, and the bill will be passed over.

AN EXAMPLE OF STRAIGHT THINKING

Mr. McCARRAN. Mr. President, these are days of confused thinking. This confusion, it has been my observation, is more noticeable here in Washington than elsewhere in the country; and I think all of us here at home are more confused about the really important issues of the day than are the men who have followed our flag to the far corners of the world.

As exemplification of this straight thinking, which is characteristic of those men, I hold in my hand a letter received from one who only a few short years ago graduated from the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis.

This young man received his appointment to the Academy from the senior Senator from Nevada. I have known this boy all his life. He comes from a splendid family. Since his graduation he has been to Korea twice, and his brother is also in Korea.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the clerk may read into the RECORD a portion of this young American's letter.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will read the letter referred to.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

When are these friends of yours in Washington going to wake up to the fact that the Commies don't know what the word "armistice" means, nor truth, nor honesty, nor decency? They have but one thought, and that is the complete defeat of what they call capitalism, but which actually is you and me. For the first time in the proud and successful history of America we have a government which is ruled by fear. The Commies are shooting at us day and night and laying mines at every opportunity, but I'm not afraid, and the thousands with me aren't afraid. How can men—I use the term to denote the male sex—in Washington be afraid? Let's break out of our fat, decadent, selfish, spineless fog and clean house—at home and abroad. If we're to be the leaders of the world, then let us be leaders, in every sense of the word, and that means honesty, integrity, courage, unselfishness, and good old American guts.

REPORT ON CONFERENCE OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE ORGANIZATION

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, I should like to give the Senate a report on the Conference of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations which I attended as a member of the United States delegation. This was the sixth session of the Conference of Foreign Agriculture Organization but the first held in Rome since the Organization moved its headquarters there last April. It met from November 19 through December 6, 1951.

I am sure the Senate knows that FAO was the first of the U. N. organizations to be founded after the last war. It was established in 1945 for the purpose of increasing the efficiency of food and agriculture, improving nutrition and raising the standard of living of people throughout the world. The Soviet Union never joined this organization and none of the Soviet bloc countries is a member.

The Conference was held in the fine new building that the Italian Government completed as part of FAO's headquarters just before the Conference opened. Italy's Prime Minister Alcide de Gasperi turned the building over to FAO's Director-General Norris E. Dodd on the Conference's first day.

POPULATION OUTRUNNING FOOD PRODUCTION

The shocking fact that world population is outstripping world food production was foremost in the minds of our United States delegation and the 63 other delegations at this Conference. How to alter this fact, and reverse this disastrous trend, was the main theme of the Conference debates and actions. The key to reversing the trend was well stated by Dr. Henry G. Bennett, the late Administrator of the United States Technical Cooperation, or point 4 program, when he addressed the Conference toward its close. We have all been terribly saddened by the tragic loss of Dr. Bennett with Mrs. Bennett and his party. The American people and Government have lost a great leader and a faithful public servant.

His words at the Conference stand out all the more strongly now. "We must face the reality that we are losing the fight of increasing food production as compared with increasing population in the world, and it is not necessary. We can win the fight. It can be won because we have enough scientific and technical knowledge now available, if applied, to produce sufficient food to feed adequately and well all of the teeming millions of the world. By joining hands together we can win this fight and can win it in this generation." The way to win it, Dr. Bennett said, is through universal education, through experimentation and research and through extension.

DIRECTOR-GENERAL'S PROPOSALS

Director-General Dodd, who, by the way, is a very fine American and had had years of experience farming in his native Oregon, and administering agricultural programs in the United States Department of Agriculture, laid the problem and his proposed action to meet it on the line before the delegates in Commission I. This was one of the three commissions into which the Conference was organized in order to conduct its business. Commission I took care of the agenda items on world food and agriculture policy, land reform, international commodity problems, migration, famine relief, and others of the same sort. Commission II undertook a detailed review of the work of the various divisions of FAO and other key subjects closely allied with the program of work. Commission III set the level of FAO's budget for 1952 and 1953, and took up a number of administrative problems that had to be settled.

The Director-General put his proposals bluntly, and I think the delegates were glad he did. They must have liked the way Mr. Dodd stated his proposals, because later in the Conference they reelected him, almost unanimously, for a 2-year term as Director-General. He said:

> We have had a series of conferences. Member countries have made recommendations to themselves and each other. The fact is that these recommendations have not been carried out. Frankly, member countries as a whole have not fulfilled the obligations they accepted in signing the FAO constitution. * * * The time has come not merely for a confession of shortcomings. This is an occasion for a change of heart and a determination to mend our ways in the future.

The Director-General proposed an immediate action program to "set in motion an upward spiral of agricultural production and productivity in the underdeveloped and food-deficit areas." His proposals were under two headings: planning and action. Under planning, he proposed that the Conference set a world target of increased agricultural production for the next 5 or 10 years, that member countries set up agricultural-development programs to achieve their part of the world target, and that these programs be reviewed at regional meetings in the spring of 1953 to promote regional coordination. For action, he proposed that member countries establish and strengthen their extension services.

The Director-General's proposals were a real challenge to the Conference. We of the United States delegation were particularly glad to note the emphasis he gave to extension services. We have always felt that our cooperative Federal-State Extension Service in this country is one of the greatest factors in the agricultural progress that we have made, and that it is one of the real contributions we can make to other countries that want to improve their agricultural production. We have consistently pressed this point in previous FAO conferences and were glad that it received such prominence both in Commission I and in Commission II.

As soon as the Conference started discussing increased production, it ran directly into the problem of prices of agricultural products, and the necessity for maintaining those prices. The age-old fear of farmers, of course, is that production in excess of immediate demand means surpluses which depress prices for agricultural products.

Many delegates pointed out the need for action to guarantee to farmers that increased production will not mean lower prices. The action suggested was of two sorts, national programs and international ones. The national programs would be something on the order of our commodity-loan and price-support programs. International ones suggested were mostly commodity agreements, like the wheat agreement.

The debate on the Director-General's proposals, and on the other pressing subjects, such as land reform, on the agenda of Commission I, went on for several days. Commission I broke up into three committees, for detailed discussion and preparation of reports and recommendations. When the debate was concluded and the recommendations approved and accepted first by Commission I and then by the full Conference, the Director-General's proposals received full approval.

INCREASED PRODUCTION

The Conference set a target for an increase in world food production for the years immediately ahead of at least 1 to 2 percent over the rate of population increase. It recommended that member governments of FAO should set up and carry out agricultural development plans to achieve their part of this objective. These plans and progress in meeting the goals will be reviewed in regional meetings in the spring of 1953. Meanwhile the Director-General is authorized to help governments increase their production.

The conference also supported the Director-General in his emphasis on extension services as the most effective way to expand agricultural production. It called on all member governments to establish effective extension organizations to bring technical information down to the man on the land.

AGRICULTURAL COMMODITIES

The Conference recognized, in its conclusions, that the increased production could only be achieved if farmers were assured that they could market their products at a fair return to them. It put the main burden for giving farmers this assurance on each member government. It also reaffirmed its faith in international commodity agreements as a means of assuring stable markets and recommended that the Economic and Social Council, when it reviews chapter VI of the Habana Charter, consider providing for negotiating commodity agreements in times of shortages or fluctuation, as well as in times of surpluses. It agreed that the work of the FAO Committee on Commodity Problems should be continued and expanded and suggested that the committee devote attention to measures, in addition to international commodity agreements, to improve the marketing of agricultural commodities both nationally and internationally.

In this connection there was a most interesting discussion of regional agricultural integration. This is a particularly lively topic in Europe, where a number of suggestions for European agricultural arrangements have been made, somewhat along the lines of the Schuman plan for coal and steel. None of these plans is as yet sufficiently crystalized to become a concrete proposal, and the conference recognized that the main responsibility for developing regional arrangements rests outside FAO. It did, however, give its blessing to any regional discussions designed to increase agricultural efficiency and productivity and widen trade areas through the reduction of trade barriers on both a regional and a world-wide basis.

LAND REFORM

One of the most satisfactory actions of the Conference for the United States delegation was taken on land reform. This subject has been on the agenda of other FAO conferences, also, but this Conference provided the best full-dress debate so far. It has preceded by the action on land reform of the U. N. General Assembly last fall and the Economic and Social Council this past summer, and was based on a comprehensive report on land reform prepared jointly by FAO and the U. N. at the request of the General Assembly. The resolution of the Conference on land reform, or reform of agrarian structures as they called it, was about the same as the resolution introduced by the United States with some amendments which we felt were improvements over our original resolution.

The discussion of this subject at the FAO Conference was sound, partly because FAO has none of the Soviet-bloc countries as a member. So we did not have to spend a lot of time showing up the lies that the countries behind the iron curtain tell about us in the U. N.

We were especially glad that the major United States statement on land reform at this Conference was made by Representative CLIFFORD R. HOPE, of Kansas. Representative HOPE's broad experience from years of devoted service to the welfare of American agriculture in the United States Congress made him ideally suited for giving this statement. I might mention in passing that the Senator from North Dakota and I unanimously recommended that Representative HOPE make this statement.

Representative HOPE made it clear that we in the United States are convinced that the best relationship of the man to the soil he works is individual ownership, from the standpoint of the greatest incentive to increased production and good land management, as well as advancement of human dignity. Therefore, opportunity for ownership of land is a key part of our concept of land reform. But he showed that when we talk about land reform we mean a lot more than just distributing land. We mean a farmer must be able to make a living on the land he owns, and he must be given fair conditions of tenancy. He needs instruction in the best methods of farm-

ing, opportunity to obtain credit at reasonable rates, facilities—especially cooperatives—for getting supplies and for marketing products, and reform of exorbitant rents and taxes.

The debate on land reform at the Conference showed the great interest that the subject aroused. There was general approval of the United States resolution. The Conference recognized that action on this problem must be up to governments themselves, and it urged member governments to put the various measures included in the broad concept of land reform into effect. It also urged them to ask FAO for assistance through its technical-assistance program in getting these measures under way. It asked the Director-General to be ready to assist governments and to organize regional training centers or conferences on land reform. On this last point many of the delegates mentioned the great value of the World Land Tenure Conference held this fall at the University of Wisconsin.

Many of the delegates said that the FAO Conference's action on land reform would help them get action in their own countries. This sort of comment is good to hear, coming out of an international meeting.

Several other items on the agenda of Commission I are worthy of note. The discussion on investment for agricultural development resulted in conclusions for national and international action. On national action, member governments were urged to promote the establishment of credit facilities for farmers, fishermen, and foresters. On international action the Director-General was instructed to continue and intensify his cooperation with the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, and, among other steps, organize further training centers on economic development in cooperation with other U. N. agencies. Very successful training centers of this sort have already been held or are in process in the Far East, the Middle East, and Latin America.

The discussion on migration approved the relationships that have been worked out between FAO and the International Labor Office and other international agencies that have the primary responsibility for helping people migrate from densely populated places to those which can absorb more people. The conference agreed that FAO would stand ready to advise on specific land-settlement programs.

The subject of food shortages and famine was referred to the FAO Conference by the Economic and Social Council. The Conference agreed, as recommended by the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations that FAO would take on the responsibility of keeping a close check on developing food shortages. If FAO, after thorough examination, feels that international action is required, the Director-General will report this to the U. N. and call a meeting of FAO's Council or interested governments to see what governments and voluntary agencies can do to relieve the shortages.

This discussion of food shortages brought up the question of establishing an emergency food reserve which can be made available to relieve famine. Since this problem has a number of complex angles that all governments need to think over very carefully, such as how the food reserve would be financed and controlled, the question was passed on to FAO's Council for further consideration.

PROGRAM OF WORK

The detailed discussion and approval of FAO's work program in technical assistance, agriculture, economics, forestry, fisheries, and nutrition was discussed division by division and project by project in Commission II of the Conference.

The Conference approved a job of redirecting FAO's program for the immediate future and its long-term trends done by a working party appointed by the last Conference. Dr. Cardon of the United States Department of Agriculture served as chairman of this small group of representatives of governments.

The working party assigned priorities for FAO's work, giving highest priority to all activities designed to increase supplies of food. This establishment of priorities was especially valuable, since over the years of its existence FAO, with a small budget in view of the enormity of its task, had been asked by conference after conference to undertake a great number of projects. The working party report cuts through the diversity and complexity of these assignments and permits FAO to concentrate on the most essential jobs it has.

TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE

The discussion on FAO's expanded technical assistance program gave a thrill of achievement and pride to the Conference delegates. This program is a counterpart of the United States point 4 program. It is made possible by a separate U. N. fund subscribed to by most of the members of the U. N. FAO was allotted 29 percent of this fund for the first year, which amounted to nearly $4,000,000.

The Conference was unanimous in its approval of the remarkable job that FAO has done in getting its technical assistance program under way rapidly and competently. The job was done under very difficult conditions, since the Organization moved its headquarters from Washington to Rome right in the middle of the work of getting agreements negotiated and signed with countries receiving assistance, getting experts recruited, oriented, and on their way to their posts, and all the rest of the job.

Despite these difficulties, by the time of the Conference FAO had signed technical assistance agreements with 48 countries or territories, had 226 experts from 32 countries either in the field or returned from short-term assignments, 45 more in the process of being assigned, and had requests for 107 additional ones. The conference endorsed the technical qualifications of the experts recruited.

One of the aspects of the technical assistance work that drew special attention was the need for coordination of the various technical assistance programs, both the international ones of other U. N. agencies, and national ones, the various technical assistance program and the British Commonwealth's Colombo plan for Asian countries.

EXTENSION SERVICES

One of the special items on the agenda of Commission II was a discussion of extension services. The fact that this was on the agenda and the discussion itself were both very gratifying to the United States delegation. For a number of years in previous FAO conferences the United States representatives had stressed the United States' view that extension services are of paramount importance for getting the world's knowledge of improved techniques of agriculture put to use by farmers themselves. We had not been able in these earlier conferences to get much acceptance of our point of view by other delegations. This was partly because of the difficultly of understanding what we mean by the term, particularly when translated into other languages.

But at this Conference our delegation felt that for the first time there was general understanding of what we were talking about, and general acceptance of the first-line importance of extension work for improving world agriculture and increasing world production. As noted earlier, the Director-General highlighted the basic importance of extension services in Commission I, and the Conference approved his recommendation that governments establish extension services and make them really effective. The discussion in Commission II brought out the essential details of what extension work is and how it must work.

INTERNATIONAL PLANT PROTECTION CONVENTION

This Conference approved a revision of the International Plant Protection Convention of 1929. This is designed to strengthen and coordinate international efforts for the control of plant diseases and pests and prevention of their spread. It provides, among other measures, for immediate world reporting of outbreaks of plant diseases or pests. The proposed revision was discussed at several special meetings at which the United States was represented by persons especially qualified in the field of plant disease and pest control. After the Conference approved the convention, Dr. Cardon signed it for the United States, and representatives of 21 other governments also signed. Others will sign it later. The convention will, of course, have to be approved by Congress.

LOCUST CONTROL

The Conference approved the recommendations of a meeting on control of the desert locust which FAO called in October shortly before the Conference. These recommendations would set up a technical committee on desert locust control, which is a valuable mechanism for a regional approach to the problem. Locust control must be approached in this way, since by the time a swarm of locusts crosses a national boundary, it is usually too late for control measures to be really effective.

In addition to being a sensible regional approach to the problem, this Conference action is a good example of coordination of United States technical assistance

with FAO's. The United States agreed to make equipment for combating locusts available through its technical-assistance program on the advice of FAO's Desert Locust Control Committee.

WORK OF DIVISIONS

In general, the United States delegation was well satisfied with the work of FAO's Divisions of Agriculture, Economics, Forestry, Fisheries, and Nutrition, after a detailed review of the work of each.

In agriculture, in addition to the actions already noted, and among many of equal note, the Conference was particularly interested in seeing that the work in rural welfare and cooperatives was pressed vigorously. The work in animal-disease control was especially commended. Through the technical-assistance program it now looks as though it is possible to eradicate the deadly tropical rinderpest disease.

Among the projects stressed in economics were those on the world census of agriculture, commodity studies, training centers on economic development, and improvement of national statistical services.

In forestry, some of the especially noteworthy actions were the adoption of principles of forestry policy for the guidance of member governments in their forestry programs, approval of the establishment of an International Chestnut Commission to control the devastation of chestnut blight that threatens an important factor in the economy of European countries, efforts to increase production of wood pulp and paper, and greater attention to land and water conservation and range management. The Conference gave particular approval to a forest-fire-control study tour held in the United States last summer in cooperation with the United States Forest Service and ECA.

The discussion of fisheries work highlighted the establishment of a Latin-American Fisheries Council to promote improved production and utilization of fish in this area, and the Conference's estimate that world fish production could be doubled over its present figure without risk to resources.

Activities in nutrition that drew special emphasis were the shortage of protein foods, the importance of good nutrition and good home management to child welfare, FAO's stepped-up work in home economics, and the good cooperation that has been developed with the World Health Organization through a joint FAO-WHO Committee. This Committee has worked on a number of subjects, such as a report on prevention and treatment of severe malnutrition in times of disaster.

FAO'S BUDGET AND ADMINISTRATION

Some of the most vigorous debates of the Conference took place in Commission III on questions of the level of FAO's budget for 1952 and 1953, on the scale of contributions that member governments contribute to the budget, on the currency in which the contributions are to be paid, and on a number of other financial and administrative problems.

BUDGET FOR 1953

Early in the Conference session Commission III agreed to a budget of $5,250,000 for 1952 and $5,000,000 for 1953. The purpose was to give FAO an expenditure budget—as contrasted with an assessment budget—of $5,000,000 for both years. The budget was set at $5,250,000 for 1952 to take care of the fact that Hungary and China, though they have announced their withdrawal from FAO, are still, according to FAO's Constitution, considered members for a year after the announcement of withdrawal. They must, therefore, be included in the assessment for 1952, though no one expects that they will pay their contribution.

But as the Conference progressed and Commission I and Commission II gave the green light for jobs they wanted FAO to do that were not included in the budget prepared before the Conference opened, considerable sentiment developed among the delegates for an increased budget for 1953. This sentiment was surprisingly strong in view of the fact that the Organization will have 25 percent more funds available in 1952 than it spent in 1951. It wound up 1951 with a surplus of around $600,000 as a result of unavoidable delays in filling vacancies caused by the move of headquarters from Washington to Rome. This surplus was used for loan repayment.

Paying off the loan in a lump sum meant that an additional $200,000 would be available in 1952 and 1953 for program work, since this amount had been budgeted in each year for paying off the loan. Because of this, and because the budget would, without the proposed increase, provide around $1,000,000 more than was available in 1951, a number of delegates were unable to agree to the increase. Commission III passed the issue up to the full Conference, where a vote was taken and a budget of $5,250,000 for 1953 was approved.

SCALE OF CONTRIBUTIONS

The action on the scale of contributions was of particular interest to all of the member countries of FAO and especially to the United States delegation. For several years, since the U. N. agreed in 1948 that the contributions scales in the specialized agencies should be based on principles more nearly comparable with those applied in the U. N. organization, the United States has been under pressure to increase its percentage contribution to FAO. In 1949, it was increased from 25 percent to 27.1 percent in order to assume a proportionate share of an undistributed part of the scale which had been reserved in anticipation that certain countries that had been members of the Interim Commission would become members of FAO. When these countries did not become FAO members the 1949 adjustment was made to establish a 100-percent scale in FAO. Since that time the United States has maintained that it was unwilling to consider any increase in its contribution to FAO until reductions were made in its contributions to other international organizations such as the U. N., WHO, and UNESCO, where its percentage contribution was inordinately high.

At the FAO Conference Canada, France, Egypt, United Kingdom, and South Africa all opened the discussion on the scale of contributions, stressing the importance of achieving greater uniformity between the scale in FAO and those of other international organizations. They referred to the reduction of the ceiling to 33⅓ percent in UNESCO and WHO effective in 1952, and the proposed reduction of the U. N. ceiling in 1952 from 38.92 percent to 36.90 percent. Based on these developments, and in the light of the position previously taken by the United States that, if and when ceilings in the other organizations were reduced, the United States would be willing to reconsider the FAO ceiling, all spoke in favor of a proposal by the delegate of France that the ceiling of the FAO scale be increased to 30 percent.

The United States representative reiterated the position which the United States has taken all along—that the principle of sovereign equality in any international organization should be recognized as a primary basis for any scale of contributions. After referring to the 25 percent ceiling established in 1945 by the Interim Commission, he pointed out that over a period of years it had become apparent that the majority of FAO member governments felt that the principle of uniformity in the various scales and the ceilings of these scales should be accepted in FAO, although the United States had voted against the resolution to that effect which was adopted by the General Assembly in 1948. He stated that, in view of the position the United States has taken over the past 2 years, that if satisfactory progress were made in reducing the disproportionate ceilings of some of the other specialized agencies, the United States would review its position with respect to the FAO ceiling, and that since ceiling reductions were being effected in the U. N., UNESCO, and WHO for 1952, the United States would not object to the proposed increase in the ceiling of the FAO scale of contributions, but that for the present his Government could not accept a ceiling higher than 30 percent.

The Conference adopted the French proposal.

CURRENCY OF CONTRIBUTIONS

This was a difficult problem for Commission III to resolve, inasmuch as an amendment to the financial regulations required a two-thirds majority vote. At one point it appeared that Commission III would not be able to reach a decision, and the problem was referred to a plenary session. When the matter came up for discussion in the full conference, however, a compromise solution proposed by the delegate of France was agreed to by the United States and the United Kingdom, who had been the principal proponents of the two differing points of view on this subject.

When FAO 2 years ago voted to move its headquarters from Washington to Rome, one of the principal factors influencing the determination was the dollar shortage and the desire on the part of many of the member countries to relieve themselves of paying their contributions to FAO in United States dollars.

Nevertheless, it was generally recognized that the Organization would require a substantial part of its annual budget in United States dollars, and it was estimated that such expenditures would constitute not less than 40 percent of the total expenditures of the Organization. In trying to reach agreement on a method which would grant relief to member countries having United States dollar shortages, but which at the same time would provide sufficient dollars to meet the dollar needs of the Organization without adopting regulations which would discriminate among member governments with respect to currencies, FAO was faced with adopting one of two alternatives which were before this Conference.

One alternative sponsored by the United Kingdom and Egypt, and supported by many other countries, proposed that member countries make their contributions in their national currency, provided they were freely convertible into lire, and that all members not paying their contributions in United States dollars be required to pay such percentage of their contributions in United States dollars as was necessary to meet the dollar needs of the Organization.

The other alternative sponsored by the United States, and put forward by the twelfth session of the Council for consideration of the Conference, proposed a procedure somewhat like that presently followed in the United Nations organization. Under the United States proposal, the Director General, after consulting with a representative number of member nations and determining what the United States dollar income would be, would notify each member nation not paying its contribution in United States dollars of the amount of such currency it would be required to pay to meet the dollar needs of the Organization; the remainder of the contribution of each such member to be paid in lire or in its own currency, provided such currency was freely convertible into lire.

The compromise solution proposed by the delegate of France, which was finally adopted by the Conference, accepted the United States proposal with an amendment requiring that the dollar assessment against the various member governments be determined by the Conference, rather than by the Director-General.

ELECTIONS

Four new members, Japan, Argentina, Laos, and Nepal, were voted in as members of FAO at the Conference. With Hungary and China dropping out during 1952, and with Peru considered no longer a member because its parliament has never ratified its membership, this makes a total of 67 countries which are members of FAO.

The entire 18 country membership of FAO's Council was elected at this Conference. Twelve countries took office immediately, and six countries will begin their 3-year terms in 1953. The Council meets between the biennial sessions of the full Conference of all member countries. Brazil, Canada, Chile, Italy, Australia, Egypt, France, India, Pakistan, the United Kingdom, the Union of South Africa, and the United States were all reelected to the Council. Finland, Cuba, the Philippines, the Netherlands, Colombia, and Spain were elected to fill positions held by other countries in the old Council.

Prof. Josue de Castro, Director of the National Nutrition Laboratory of Brazil, was elected Independent Chairman of the Council. He succeeded Viscount Bruce, of Melbourne, who has been one of the guiding spirits of FAO from its beginning, and had a major hand in developing the ideas which led to FAO's founding. The Conference approved a suggestion of the United States delegation to express its great appreciation for the leadership and service Lord Bruce has given to FAO, and its great regret at his retirement from active participation in FAO's work.

As mentioned earlier, Norris E. Dodd was reelected as Director-General of FAO for a 2-year term.

REPEAL OF EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HENNINGS in the chair). The question is on agreeing to the amendment of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER].

THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY AND POWER PROJECT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, for over 30 years the States in the Northwest have been trying to have the St. Lawrence seaway bill passed. For over 30 years, whenever the legislature of North Dakota has met, it has made appropriations to enable the committee having charge of that matter in the Northwest to have sufficient funds with which to issue literature and to pay the officials who have charge of the particular work dealing with the St. Lawrence waterway.

During that time six Presidents of the United States have recommended construction of the St. Lawrence waterway. We in the Northwest favor it because at the present time we are at the mercy of the railroads, whereas if the St. Lawrence waterway were in operation, it would reduce the price of shipping our grain to the market to the extent of approximately 7 cents a bushel.

At this time, Mr. President, I wish to address myself further, as I have done on various other occasions on the floor of the Senate, to this particular subject.

I wish to reiterate that for a comparatively short distance along the frontier of the United States and Canada flows a golden river of opportunity. It is the historic St. Lawrence; a river of promise and opportunity; a river possessed of a sleeping giant. In fact, the St. Lawrence is a river of such importance to America that if we were to make effective use of its surging power we might change the course of history.

To those of us who live in North Dakota, 2,500 miles from any seaport, the St. Lawrence and what it could do for the heart of America have long been highly important.

We can visualize a ship loaded with goods coming 3,000 miles across the Atlantic, and then by inland waters almost as far again into the very center of a great continent. We can visualize, when that ship leaves, with the rich products of the Middle West aboard her, enroute to the markets of the world. We can visualize the vast flow of wheat, coal, oil and ore that will move from the Midwest to ports all over the world.

The Department of Commerce has estimated that the potential traffic on the St. Lawrence, if it were made usable for seagoing ships, may reach between 57,000,000 and 84,000,000 tons in 1 year.

Let us remember that all this vast tonnage will be moved at a saving in shipping costs that will be of benefit not only to the farmer in North Dakota and Iowa, but to the laboring man in Indiana and Colorado and the consumer in Illinois and New York—in fact, to people everywhere throughout the United States.

It is to this Congress, in this year of 1952, with very fine leadership in this matter by the able senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], who has been most diligent in this field both last year and for many years past, that falls the responsibility of determining whether the great potential of the St. Lawrence is to be realized and whether it is to contribute its latent strength to our side in the world struggle we are in.

Year in and year out, the Congress has been talking of the St. Lawrence seaway and its associated hydroelectric developments. Year in and year out, organized minority opposition has been permitted to delay something which is in the best interests of our country, of Canada, and of all other freedom-loving lands.

Perhaps we need to change but one word to get a better understanding of the dual purposes served by the St. Lawrence development. From now on, let us call it the St. Lawrence powerway, because whether we are thinking of the benefits which will come from the hyroelectric installations or from the linking of the seven seas with the Great Lakes, what we are developing in either case is power—power to produce and power to maintain our agricultural and industrial greatness. To discourage aggression, we must be powerful; and we cannot be powerful unless we continue to add to our productive capacity.

As the connecting traffic link between our inland ports and the Atlantic Ocean and as a tremendous potential hydroelectric-power source, the St. Lawrence is the greatest single undeveloped natural resource on the American continent.

(At this point Mr. LANGER yielded to Mr. CAPEHART, who moved to recommit, with instructions, Senate bill 2104. Mr. CAPEHART'S motion and the ensuing debate were, at the request of Mr. LANGER, and by unanimous consent, ordered printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of Mr. LANGER'S remarks.)

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, few nations have been so fortunate as to have

nature and geography conspire to place the right kind of a river in the right place. Few rivers have the unique advantages of the St. Lawrence in the terms of being a protected inland waterway; of having a steady and reliable flow of water; of having the Great Lakes to form a natural reservoir and of having a series of rapids in one small stretch where there is a sudden and turbulent rush of water to the sea.

Look anywhere in the world, Mr. President, and where would you find anything to compare to this treasure house which nature has contrived, for man to bend to his own use?

The St. Lawrence powerway is there to be used for the benefit of all of America, there to benefit all our people if we but have the courage and resolution to go at the job.

I ask, Has the Congress lost faith in America? Are we growing so timid that we are afraid to tackle the big jobs?

This is an election year. And it is especially fitting that this is a year of decision on the St. Lawrence powerway. Let all who must go before the people put themselves on record as to whether they voted for or against the St. Lawrence powerway. If, by chance, the St. Lawrence development is once more refused the opportunity of an open vote in both Houses of Congress, then the people by their votes will pass judgement on the issue of courage versus faint-heartedness. Or should I say, the issue of the Nation's interests versus the interests of short-sighted pressure groups?

Those who have in the past been the captives of these pressure groups should pause and consider how they may best serve their country. Do they serve America best by upholding the national interest or by abject submission to a few selfish interests falsely claiming to be protectors of a region's economy and prosperity? Some New York and New England seaports oppose the St. Lawrence powerway. But they are also opposing the best interests of the entire areas surrounding them. Midwestern and eastern railways oppose the St. Lawrence powerway. Their opposition is at the expense of the best interests of the regions the railways serve.

This is the year when each Member of the Congress has the responsibility to stand up and be counted as to whether he is a friend or a foe of the St. Lawrence powerway.

The St. Lawrence development has been so lied about, so muddled by propaganda and so battered by delays that the facts have been all but lost in the confusion. This is the time and the place to restate what is to be done, how long it will take, how much it will cost, and the benefits which will result.

First, let us remember that this is an international development. Canada and the United States will share the costs and share the benefits. Canada is far ahead of us. While we have been delaying, Canada has been at work. Canada has been pressing for years to get this job done. We, who in the past have so prided ourselves upon being great developers, are the ones who are lagging. If we continue to lag, Canada may build the seaway in her own waters. Canada, then, would stand to get all the benefits at our expense.

The self-liquidating St. Lawrence powerway is two things: it is a seaway and it is a power development. They go hand in hand. One without the other does not make sense. This is true because of the unique 114-mile stretch of the St. Lawrence between Montreal and Ogdensburg, N. Y. Along this section the stream drops sharply and creates a series of turbulent rapids, which form a barrier to deep-sea navigation. These rapids are at the same time ideal sites for hydroelectric installations. In solving the problem of deep-sea navigation in this part of the St. Lawrence we are rewarded with a bonus in the form of cheap, abundant, and reliable hydroelectric power.

The two things which the St. Lawrence powerway will accomplish are, first, a navigable channel with a minimum depth of 27 feet from the seaport of Montreal to the ports of the Great Lakes. From the Atlantic Ocean to Duluth, on Lake Superior, this would be a sea lane of about 2,350 miles; second, hydroelectric installations at the rapids, which would permit the United States and Canada to share equally an annual supply of around 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours of cheap hydro power.

So far as navigation is concerned, existing lakes, rivers, and canals make 95 percent of the job complete. Only 5 percent more needs to be done to make deep-sea navigation an established fact.

For the joint purposes of deep-sea navigation and power development, here are the things which need to be done; first, build a control dam in the international rapids section of the St. Lawrence, to maintain the level of Lake Ontario; second, build a main dam and power station near Massena, N. Y., to develop a minimum of 12,000,000,000 kilowatt-hours a year of cheap power; third, build two canals and three locks to bypass the control dam, the main dam, and the power station; fourth, build two locks to bypass the power station at Soulanges Rapids, in Canada; fifth, dredge the existing Beauharnois power canal to 27 feet and lift its bridges; sixth, develop and improve the 10-mile canal and two locks in the Lachine rapids section near Montreal; and seventh, deepen from the present 25 feet to 27 feet the existing channels of the Detroit, St. Clair, and St. Marys Rivers; the straits of Mackinac; the Welland Canal and the Thousand Islands section of the St. Lawrence.

The time schedule to do the entire job of power and navigation improvement is estimated at 5 years. Power could start flowing in 3 years.

Now what about the cost?

The cost is so small that it is difficult to believe that anyone would attempt to make a case against this expenditure. This is not a case of throwing money down the drain. This is an investment in a self-liquidating project which will pay back every cent over a period of 40 years. The Members of the Congress will bear me out that it is extremely rare that we are privileged to authorize expenditures which will pay back the investment and develop new wealth for millions of people at the same time. Yet that is what the St. Lawrence powerway will do.

When the Corps of Engineers was asked to present its estimate last winter, the total cost of the job was set at $818,063,000 of which Canada would pay $251,269,000. This takes into account the fact that Canada has already spent over $132,000,000 on the development..

The United States share would be $566,794,000 of which $374,301,000 is assigned to navigation and $192,493,000 for hydroelectric power.

There is one other proposal which would make still lower the over-all cost, and that is a proposal which I do not favor. The State of New York is most anxious to gain control of the distribution and sale of power after the dam is built. The State of New York after the construction of the power stations would reimburse the Federal Government the $192,493,000. This would lower the Federal outlay to $374,301,000.

I am against the New York State proposal because it does not give the people the assurance that the non-profit-preference clause of the Flood Control Act will be in effect. The power policy of this Government has been clearly stated. It is that whenever the funds of all the people are used to construct hydroelectric developments, then the nonprofiteering rural electric cooperatives, municipalities, and public power districts should be the preferred customers.

Unless the State of New York agrees to follow this nonprofiteering clause, there exists the danger that commercial utilities would sew up all the power at the bus bar and follow their usual practice of selling this cheap power at the same price they demand for steam-generated power.

It is not in the public interest that the Congress enter into any deal which sells out the rights of the people. We are honor bound to see to it that there is no profiteering, particularly with power developed by the people.

The Congress has three alternatives in the development of the St. Lawrence powerway. First, to authorize Federal participation with Canada in the construction of the seaway and Federal construction and operation of the hydroelectric facilities; second, to authorize Federal participation with Canada on the navigation part of the project and permit the State of New York to build or to operate the hydroelectric facilities; and, third, to permit Canada to do the entire job on the seaway and permit commercial utilities to build and operate the hydroelectric plant.

Since both the navigation and the power generation possibilities are definitely in the realm of the national interest and vital to national progress, it appears clear that the Congress in meeting its responsibilities to all the people needs to proceed under the first proposal, namely, Federal participation with Canada on the seaway itself and Federal construction and operation of the giant hydroelectric plant.

Without New York State participation the Federal outlay would be $566,794,000

in the form of a self-liquidating investment.

How would that sum be amortized over the 40-year period? The answer comes from two sources of revenue: First, ship tolls; and, second, sale of power.

This is one of the best bargains ever to come before us.

And more than being a bargain, the seaway alone represents a major weapon in the arsenal of democracy. It is closely linked to the future economic development of the United States and Canada. That means all of us, no matter where we live.

Steel, electricity, aluminum, and copper are at the base of our industrial strength. We know how urgently the United States is pressing to develop increased production of these items.

Iron ore is a major strategic item. The great Mesabi Range with its treasure trove of iron ore has been responsible for the vast industrial complex which surrounds the Great Lakes. The blast furnaces, the factories, the machine works of Chicago, Detroit, Cleveland, Buffalo, Toledo, Youngstown, Gary, and Pittsburgh owe their existence to the fact that cheap water transportation across the Great Lakes brings an assured supply of ore to the mills from the Mesabi Range. The great middle western plant is already built and in existence.

But what about the supply of ore from the Mesabi Range? Not only is that supply of ore shrinking, but at the same time our complex civilization is also demanding more and more steel. We are searching the world for new supplies of iron ore. Two new sources have been located in the Americas. One source is Venezuela. The other is Labrador.

The Bureau of Mines has estimated that by 1960 the United States must be prepared to import 46,000,000 tons of high-grade ore as compared to 7,000,000 tons in 1949.

Venezuela and Labrador are our nearest assured sources. From Venezuela to Baltimore or Philadelphia is a voyage of around 2,000 miles in the open seas. We need only to realize that in event of another war all the ore-carrying vessels to and from Latin America would have to move under convoy.

And another thing. It is the history of the steel industry that steel mills move to meet the iron ore at a point nearest to its source. We are already seeing examples of that. At Baltimore, the Bethlehem Steel Co. has spent more than $60,000,000 in loading and storage facilities for iron ore. The flames of the blast furnaces light the Baltimore sky at night.

Some 15 miles north of Philadelphia, the United States Steel Corp. is now in the process of building the Fairless Works at Morrisville, Pa. How much will that cost? United States Steel says this new mill cost $400,000,000. Think of that. The building of one steel mill in a new location costs almost as much as the United States share of the St. Lawrence powerway.

Is this to be the pattern of the future? Are we to see a migration of the steel industry from the Great Lakes area in search of ore? Are the steel furnaces to be banked and the skilled workmen turned away because there is not enough ore nearby and because railway shipping costs from the Atlantic would make it impossible for the mills to compete?

The Labrador ore fields are estimated to contain 400,000,000 tons of high-grade ore. The fields will be in production by 1954 at an estimated rate of 20,000,000 tons a year. From this new field on the Quebec-Labrador border to the St. Lawrence seaport town of Seven Islands is a distance of 350 miles. By 1954 when the fields are going into production, Canada will have completed a railway to Seven Islands and improved the harbor facilities of that town. From Seven Islands it is less than 1,000 miles down the 35-foot-deep channel of the St. Lawrence to the port of Montreal. But unless the self-liquidating seaway is completed ore will not be able to reach our mills by water.

If the seaway were completed, the iron ore from Labrador would move for its entire route in protected inland waters secure from enemy submarine attack. The alternative is to ship by water from Labrador to Atlantic Coast ports, a dangerous procedure in wartime. For the ore to move from the Atlantic coast to the Middle West steel mills by rail would add at least $3 a ton to the cost. And this cost would be paid by each citizen who uses steel.

In the face of a growing shortage of iron ore and steel are we to tell Canada to find another market for her ore?

Although iron and steel are highly important reasons why the St. Lawrence powerway should be promptly started, there are other reasons, and they are equally valid.

To the 50,000,000 Americans who live in the Great Lakes States, the benefits of ocean shipping are so widespread as to touch every segment of the population. To the farmer there is the great promise of lowered shipping costs for grain, a benefit which will extend back to the Rocky Mountains and as deep as the Southwest. Farmers will be able to send their dairy and grain products directly to Atlantic Coast and overseas ports on a single shipment without rehandling. The savings on a bushel of wheat would amount to 5 and 10 cents a bushel as compared with railway charges.

Railway spokesmen say that the competition of water shipments will hurt them, but they too seem to have no faith in America. They said the same thing about the airplane. Some of them were so frightened that they wanted to put antiaircraft guns on every freight caboose. Let the railroads follow the practice of other American business firms. If they want to hold their business in the face of competition, let them introduce cheaper and more efficient ways of hauling goods; let them improve their management methods and by all means let them modernize their thinking at the same time they are modernzing their rolling stock.

If we have faith in America we know that for year after year our demands will grow greater and so will that of other peoples. To meet these demands we must produce more and do it better.

The skilled labor of the Middle West has an equally great stake in the St. Lawrence powerway. Industry will grow and prosper because the reduced cost of shipping will make it possible to produce more commodities and sell them at lower prices. When industry grows and prospers, labor does likewise. Nor should we overlook the great benefits from import-export trade which will come as the result of bringing the United States a new seacoast 8,000 miles long.

Think what it means. It will enable ocean shipping to carry cargo right into the very heart of America. And, more important, it will enable the heart of America to put its products on the market at a considerable saving in costs that have to be added when more expensive methods of transportation are used.

From the standpoint of navigation alone, the St. Lawrence powerway is a massive resource which we can no longer neglect without endangering our future. Those who counsel delay are the same ones who have been stalling this development for 20 years. If a card-bearing Communist were to so endanger the future of America we would imprison or deport him. But those who fly the banner of greed are thus far immune from punishment. How much longer will they be permitted to endanger our security and thwart the will of the people?

It is a shocking thing to see how St. Lawrence power has been wasted. Since we signed the 1932 treaty with Canada about 36,000,000 kilowatts of power have washed, wasted, to the sea.

How much does 36,000,000 kilowatts of power represent? Well, it is more than the total installed generating capacity of all private- and publicly-owned steam and hydro plants in the United States in the year 1937.

Each year since 1932, we have wasted enough electricity to make 600,000 tons of aluminum a year. United States production of aluminum in 1951 was only 860,000 tons, hardly enough to meet normal civilian requirements.

Think back but a few years to World War II when our Armed Forces suffered from too little and too late. Thousands of our men died because guns, planes, tanks, bombs, ships, and bullets were not there on time. The war lasted long and cost more in lives and dollars because we could not produce enough at high speed. We could likely build 20 St. Lawrence powerways with the money we had to waste in World War II.

Are we to repeat the process?

This time we have been warned. We still have time to build productive capacity. Who knows when time will run out? If it does, we can no longer build capacity. Everything will be concentrated on production for survival.

How much longer must this criminal waste be continued? Electricity is just as important as steel to our defense mobilization and our future security. Our new steel plants with their electrofurnaces; the aluminum pot lines; the phosphate furnaces; the power installations for atomic energy, and all our great fabricating and chemical plants all depend on adequate and reliable power so that their production flow is not halted.

And we should not forget the ever-growing demand for power on the farm.

Now that about 85 percent of our farms have electricity, farmers are using electricity to replace the farm labor which is drifting away. Between 1946 and 1950, the use of electricity on the farm increased 160 percent and it is expected to more than double again in the next 5 years. The amount of electricity used by American industry will shortly be two and a half times greater per man-hour than in 1945.

The Defense Electric Power Administration says that we will need 9,500,000 more kilowatts in 1952 than in 1951. There is a grave question as to whether our generating capacity can keep pace with that demand.

But look at what the St. Lawrence powerway could do to help us meet these ever-growing needs for electricity. Grand Coulee is now the biggest power project in the world. It now generates 1,758,000 kilowatts annually. The Barnhart Island powerhouse in the St. Lawrence would produce 1,881,000 kilowatts of power a year, the equivalent of 12,600,000,000 kilowatt-hours.

Consider what this means to the power-starved New England, New York, Pennsylvania, and New Jersey. In this area power is not only in short supply, it is also 20 to 30 percent higher than in other sections of the country. Remember what Grand Coulee meant to the Northwest in the terms of industry, aluminum, atomic energy, and prosperity. The St. Lawrence powerway has the promise of doing the same thing in the areas where its cheap power may be used. The hydropower of the St. Lawrence will cost 2 mills a kilowatt-hour to produce. Steam-generated power in the same area at the highest efficiency cost 7 mills a kilowatt-hour to produce. But all this while, year in and year out, the cheap power has been flowing, wasted, to the sea.

And imagine the United States spends thousands of dollars a year to bring European industrialists to our country so that they may learn something of our industrial know-how.

Are we educating them in the know-how of waste? How do we explain why old industries are leaving New York and New England because of high-power costs while the solution to the problem is at our fingertips? I would repeat what the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] has so often said about the need for and development of power in the New England States. Mr. President, no one could have said it more eloquently than my distinguished friend.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. LANGER. I yield to my distinguished friend.

Mr. AIKEN. For the enlightenment of those who say that Canada is not in earnest about her intention to develop the St. Lawrence seaway, I should like to have placed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota an article appearing in the Canadian Letter, published monthly by Robertson & Morgan, who are members of the Montreal Stock Exchange, the Toronto Stock Exchange, and the Montreal Curb Market.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request by the Senator from Vermont? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 1.)

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, while I ask that this article be printed in full, I should like to read the last paragraph at this time. It reads:

> What must be said in closing, is that if the normal delays of international intercourse should be extended by blockaders, the outcome will not be an improvement in the relationship of the two peoples. The question would then arise in Canada as to whether a neighbor who is a partner in 48 miles of the St. Lawrence has a right to impede development of the whole, to Canada's economic detriment. At this writing Canada is still pinning its faith on the good neighbor policy to expedite action in Washington to release Canada to complete a communications system that is vital to her national growth.

Mr. President, if there is doubt in the mind of anyone that Canada does not intend to proceed with this seaway alone, or if there is doubt in the mind of anyone that the Canadian people do not feel keenly the unfair treatment which they have received at the hands of the United States in this respect, and which they fear they may receive at the hands of this Congress, then a reading of this letter should dispel any such doubt.

It is incredible, when we speak about developing good relations with nations at the far corners of the earth and with people in all parts of the world, that we should let a handful of selfish obstructionists mar the good relations between the United States and one of our best and nearest neighbors, Canada.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I deeply appreciate the contribution to the debate by the distinguished Senator from Vermont. The people of the Northwest know that they have no better friend in the matter of developing the St. Lawrence seaway than the distinguished Senator from the State of Vermont. For more than 10 years, at every session of Congress, I have watched him lead the great fight for the St. Lawrence waterway. I have seen him stand almost alone among Senators from the New England States fighting for this project which means so much to the people of the entire United States. I know I speak in behalf of the people of the whole Northwest when I say we feel a deep sense of gratitude toward the distinguished Senator from Vermont for the great fight he is making to help our section of the United States.

Mr. President, to resume, we should make a special project of the aluminum plant at Massena, N. Y. There is a classic example of waste. A few miles from Massena is the proposed site of the St. Lawrence power development. Yet the aluminum plant in that city was closed by the Aluminum Co. of America in 1947 because of high power costs. Last year this country was so short of aluminum that it was necessary to subsidize the plant in order that it could reopen. The United States Government pays to the Aluminum Co. of America all the cost of power over 5 mills a kilowatt-hour. It takes 10 kilowatt-hours of power to make 1 pound of aluminum. The taxpayer in North Dakota, in Oklahoma, in Oregon, or in any other State is paying, through the Federal subsidy, 5 to 6 cents a pound more than is necessary because the power used to make aluminum must come some distance from where steam-generating plants are located.

This is being done within sight of where we could have a power development the size of another Grand Coulee. Yes; we should run world tours to Massena and bring all the world's industrialists here so they may see a shining example of the know-how of waste.

The blame for this waste rests with the Senate and the House of Representatives of the United States. It is a classic example of compounding short-sightedness at the expense of the taxpayer.

Aluminum, electricity, and air power are all linked together. It was the Minneapolis Star which recently said "our shield of air power is a shield of aluminum."

Is it our short-sightedness on the St. Lawrence which presents us with the cruel fact that Russian jet fighters outnumber ours in skies over Korea? We must have aluminum if we are to build air power; and we must have low-cost reliable power to produce aluminum. Likewise, we need aluminum as a substitute for copper in the power lines which distribute electricity.

New and improved uses of aluminum are appearing each day. There is more aluminum in the new 52,000-ton liner, *The United States*, than in any other single structure yet built on land or sea. Her two stacks, largest in the world, are made entirely of aluminum and are held together by 65,000 aluminum rivets.

Our civilian needs for aluminum are also great. Because we cannot produce enough aluminum for both defense and civilian uses, the 17,000 business firms which fabricate aluminum and the 25,000 small enterprises which install, process, or sell it are seriously threatened. All these firms have a direct interest in what happens to the St. Lawrence powerway.

The capacity to generate electricity is not a local or regional problem. It is a national problem. Our entire national structure is weakened when any one great area of it does not have enough power or cheap enough power. It affects us in North Dakota. It affects you in Ohio, or anywhere else.

For a long time to come the Members of the Congress will be urging the development of new power sources in their sections of the country. We cannot consider these requests on a regional basis. The power shortage is a national problem, and we of the Congress must so view it. The St. Lawrence powerway is but one example. It deserves the support of all sections of the United States. Other power developments deserve the same support.

When we consider the millions and millions of Americans who stand to benefit directly from the navigation and power developments of the St. Lawrence powerway, it becomes increasingly diffi-

cult to understand why it was not approved and completed years ago.

Now we are in a year of decision. It is a time to put an end to stalling, delay, and deceit.

It is time to put a stop to deals and connivings.

It is time to give the St. Lawrence powerway top priority in our legislating and to get the job done.

Those of us who are wholeheartedly committed to making America strong will make it our first order of business to transform the dream of the St. Lawrence powerway into a practical reality.

We must wake the sleeping giant in the waters of the St. Lawrence and put him to work.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that following the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota I may have printed in the body of the RECORD a very able article by G. V. Ferguson, the editor of the Montreal Star, entitled "Canada Isn't Bluffing About Seaway."

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say to the Senator from Washington that the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN] submitted a letter to be printed in the RECORD following my remarks.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Then I ask that this article be printed following the insertion by the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. LANGER. I have no objection.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

(See exhibit 2.)

EXHIBIT 1

CANADA AND THE ST. LAWRENCE SEAWAY

(By Leslie Roberts)

Unless the St. Lawrence seaway is completed without delay, Canada's growth will be seriously impaired.

It is for this and no other reason that the Government in Ottawa has announced its decision to wait no longer for the United States to implement the treaty for joint development, signed in 1932, or the subsequent agreement, written in 1941, and has moved to establish a St. Lawrence Seaway Authority to carry out a wholly Canadian navigation project.

Until a few years ago, Canada could get along with what she had, vis-à-vis what seemed then to be the prohibitive capital expenditure required to create the seaway. But, even so, she was digging the "big ditch" piecemeal, hoping that the United States would ultimately lend a hand in breaking the last bottleneck—through the 48 miles where the St. Lawrence is an international river.

World War II changed the Canadian attitude, as it revolutionized the national economy. A population increase of 25 percent and multiplication of the value of the country's production by 2½ in a single decade tells the story of what has happened. Suddenly the deep waterway became the basic essential of growth. Without it, frontiers more than 1,000 miles removed from the Lakes or the St. Lawrence, but of which the water highway is a vital communications link, could not be cracked open.

The United States, on the other hand, is no longer a frontier country. It is a thickly settled nation, crisscrossed by a network of communications. It is not a country which lives by selling the bulk of its production to the world, nor by primary resource-industries, but by secondary production for a huge internal market. Thus the United States is infinitely more self-contained than Canada is, or is likely to be. It possesses an established economy in which future industrial expansion will take place in areas already served by main routes of communication.

THE URGENCY OF CANADA'S NEED

Obviously, therefore, the United States does not require a completed seaway with the urgency with which Canada requires it. Perhaps it does not need it at all. That is for the people of the United States to decide. The single cause for complaint Canadians have is that the Congress of the United States has blocked joint action for 20 years. Yet this has been possible only because Canada has been willing until the present moment to wait for Congress to make up its mind about a treaty to which a President put his signature two decades ago. That she is now seizing the issue by the forelock is a clear clue to the changed status of Canada in the Western Hemisphere—a result of its rapid economic growth—and to the sharp change in the outlook of the Canadian people. When Canada comes to a decision today, it is not prepared to be hamstrung by what it regards as unreasonable delays. This new outlook is perhaps the most important change which has happened north of the forty-ninth parallel since the Canadian Provinces confederated in 1867.

The purpose of this letter is to clarify the new Canadian position and explain the sense of urgency which the Federal Government, a majority of the Nation's press, and a surging public opinion obviously feel. It is not suggested that no Canadian opposition exists. This opposition is negligible, however, by comparison with the volume of all-out support, and the quarters from which much of that support comes.

The Canadian railroads, which, in the beginning, and for a long time thereafter, were antiseaway, have joined the ranks of its supporters.

The port of Montreal, where shipping magnates once shuddered, as those of New York and of other United States Atlantic harbors still do, at mention of the deep-water canal system, has become ardently proseaway.

The provincial government at Quebec, once doughtily anti, is now as doughtily pro; it wants cheap water freights for iron ore from Labrador to the Great Lakes steel mills.

Manufacturers in the industrial heartland of Ontario and Quebec want cheap transportation for their goods, west to the head of the Lakes, east to the Atlantic. The heavy industries want low-cost hyrdoelectric power.

The western farmer wants to market his grain as cheaply as possible and, conversely, low freight rates on the goods he buys with the money his wheat bring in.

CAPTURING THE PUBLIC IMAGINATION

But more important than all these, and it is a comparatively new phenomenon, but actually the decisive one—the imagination of the Canadian people has been captured by the vision of the great national expansion which completion of the seaway unfolds. Seized by the vision, they are impatient of delay. It is this knowledge, that public opinion is strongly behind it, and is, in fact, pressing for action, which has led to the Canadian Government's decision to go it alone.

As with so many contentious questions which are debated endlessly before decision is reached, what the seaway is has tended to get out of focus in the public mind, particularly in the United States of America. The first need, then, would seem to be to clear away the debris and put down on paper precisely what is involved.

The essential fact is that, excepting 115 miles of river, in only 48 miles of which the United States has a vested interest as a boundary-waters partner, the seaway is already a going concern. From the western extremity of Lake Superior eastward to a point on the St. Lawrence where the cities of Ogdensburg, N. Y., and Prescott, Ontario, face each other across less than a mile of water, the deep-water works have been finished and are in operation. The chief of these is the Welland Ship Canal which bypasses Niagara, dug by Canada and completed in 1931 at a cost of $130,000,000. It could not be replaced today for less than $500,000,000. In one series of twin flight-locks, consisting of an "up" group and a "down" group, ships carrying upward of 15,000 tons of ore or coal, or more than 500,000 bushels of wheat, step down a giant's ladder, 140 feet off the Niagara escarpment, and trudge on to Lake Ontario. Each country, the United States and Canada, has built huge locks at Sault Ste. Marie, the step-up (and step-down) point between Lakes Huron and Superior. Where deepened channels have been required, they have been dredged and are maintained at Deep Seaway standards. Thus, from the head of the lakes down to the Ogdensburg-Prescott line—a distance of more than 1,000 miles—the seaway is in being.

From Montreal to the open Atlantic, the necessary works were finished long since, over a distance of another 1,000 miles.

ONLY 115 MILES TO GO

Thus, two great sections, each approximately 1,000 miles in length, already are in full operation. At the head of one section the ocean-going freighter must make its turn-around and head back to sea. At the foot of the other, the huge Upper Lakers must unload and turn back west. One fleet is landlocked, the other is locked out of the Lakes. Between these two finished sections run 115 miles of water, much of it turbulent but heavy with energy, around which shallow-draught vessels ply a series of ancient canals, climbing up and down through 21 locks, but carrying more than 5,000,000 tons of freight through the bottleneck annually.

Fabulous is the word for the traffic movement of the Lakes and the St. Lawrence. Almost 100,000,000 tons of shipping (as distinct from freight tonnage) clear through the locks at Sault Ste. Marie during an average open season. The figure for ship-clearances is in the vicinity of 10,000. The Welland Canal carries more than 10,000,000,000 tons of freight between Lakes Erie and Ontario every year.

Seaway supporters, familiar with the problem and the solution, have never suggested that breaking the bottleneck in the international section of the river, and on down to the harbor of Montreal, will release the present Great Lakes fleet for a clear run from, say, Duluth, to the harbors of the world. The heartland waters of North America are plied by a type of ship evolved by marine architects for a special job—the carrying of bulk cargoes of ore, grain, and coal over the continent's inland waters. What the architects dreamed up can best be described as a huge steel carton, standing only a few feet above the water line when filled, with a superstructure in the bows for navigation and another housing aft over the engines. Such a box will usually be more than 500 feet long by 70 in width and about 30 feet from deck level to hold bottom. At Two Harbors, on Lake Superior, 12,000 tons of ore were poured into the *D. G. Kerr* in 14½ minutes. The Canadian *Lemoyne* has taken on 17,527 tons of coal at Ashtabula, Ohio, still a record cargo. But the construction of the great floating cartons, and the absence of bulkhead support in their huge holds, militates against their use on the open sea. They simply are not built to take the buffeting of Atlantic gales.

AN OPEN WATERWAY

What the completed seaway will do will be to release the Great Lakes fleet to carry its cargoes through to Montreal, without costly

transshipment into the small-size steamboats which ply the 14-foot canals. It will enable the Lakes carriers to steam eastward down the sheltered St. Lawrence to coastal ports. If and when a canal is dug across the 14-mile isthmus of Chignecto, where the Provinces of Nova Scotia and New Brunswick meet—and the canal is an integral part of the ultimate seaway, though it may not come at first—the great boxes from the Lakes will be able to steam into the Bay of Fundy and on to the Atlantic ports of the United States, in sheltered waters throughout almost all their journey. Conversely, deep-draught freighters from far-away lands will sail into the heart of North America. Once this prospect was regarded with horror by inland shipowners. Today not enough ships sail the Lakes to handle its traffic.

Owners of the United States Great Lakes fleet, many of them steel mill operators, once bitterly opposed completion of the through route. But their opposition has disappeared, and the reason is not hard to find. The great traffic from Superior down into Huron and on to Lakes Michigan and Erie is in iron ore from the Mesabi ranges—and that traffic will soon diminish sharply. Within 10 years the steel mills of the United States must tap new sources of feed for the blast furnaces. The ore has been found. It is being developed and soon will roll down to St. Lawrence tidewater, out of Labrador, over 360 miles of railroad built solely to do this job. But on reaching salt water at Seven Islands, 300 miles east of the city of Quebec, ore ships can now move west only as far as Montreal through deep channels. There cargoes must be transferred to railroad hopper-cars for a journey of hundreds of miles to the steel mills of the interior. It cannot be transshipped into the small-size canal boats, nor would it be useful to construct special ore-carriers capable of making the voyage up the St. Lawrence, through the present canal system and on to, say, the ore ports of Erie, because the 14-foot canals already are carrying their peak load. Thus the only alternative to the provision of a through route for large ships is rail haul—and a key figure illustrates what it would mean. To carry a ton of ore from Lake Superior down to the Canadian steel mills at Hamilton on Lake Ontario costs in the vicinity of $1.50. To haul it by rail would cost more than five times as much.

THE SEAWAY A DEFENSE PROJECT

Seaway antagonists in the United States of America consistently use the argument that to complete the seaway is to provide a potential enemy with fine bombing targets. Even so, thoughtful and pro-Canadian a journal as the New York Times has cautioned, as recently as October 1951, against hasty decision (after 20 years' delay?). In rebuttal, the influential Montreal Star—which can fairly be described as being as pro-American as the Times is pro-Canadian—after remarking, on October 10, that "it becomes increasingly clear that if there is to be a seaway it will have to be built by us" commented on the bomb-target argument in these words: "The New York Times gets strangely out of step with its usually well-informed approach. It says, for instance, that the seaway's defense value is problematic, for a single bombing attack could knock out a lock * * *. The completed seaway would be no more vulnerable than the existing deep channels are."

Canadian opinion regards the project as an essential factor of the national defense, and of that of the North American land mass as a whole. In World War II, when Canada's productive economy was suddenly blown up to double its prewar size, the movement of matériel and food from the plains and industrial heartland to the Atlantic coast presented a major problem in logistics. How the effort, plus the movement of troops, was carried out over the available facilities stands as a recorded miracle. Thus in the eyes of those responsible for Canadian defense, the need for increased communications facilities in time of trouble becomes a matter of paramount importance in the national interest.

CANADA'S NEED OF POWER

The matter does not end with communications, however. Development of the power of the International Rapids, and east of the New York-Ontario boundary where the river is wholly Canadian, is as vital to the expansion of defense industries, as it is to the normal and peaceable growth of the country. In 1951, for example, the Ontario Hydro Commission—a Provincial Government operation—announced that it could carry on no longer without greatly increased supplies of power and that if the latent energy lying at its door in the St. Lawrence could not be developed without delay, the commission would be forced to resort to the construction of steam-generation plants. To any resident of a country which, as no other in the Western World, moves by the harnessed power of its great rivers, the idea that the nation's principal industrial area should be driven into the installation of steam units adjacent to a power site containing more than 2,000,000 unharnessed wild horses, has an Alice-in-Wonderland ring.

This is not the be-all and end-all of the power problem, however. From the Province of Quebec comes word that unless a start can be made on hitching the power which now courses unchecked through the Lachine Rapids, almost within Montreal's city limits, by 1955, the largest of Canada's cities will have to find another answer to its energy problem—and such talk, as in Ontario, makes nonsense to any water-power-conscious Montrealer or Quebecker. At Lachine, 1,000,000 horsepower runs unimpeded down the river. Canada does not want to harness it until the navigation question is settled. Only a few miles to the west is the great Beauharnois development, totaling more than 2,000,000 horsepower. When completed it will be the biggest single hydroelectric installation in the world. Yet, Beauharnois will not take up all the slack.

The question which looms large in Canadian minds, therefore, is "Can the blockade continue, now that we are ready to go it alone?" It does not seem likely, but it remains possible.

STEPS TO BE TAKEN

Washington will have to decide through what agency the United States will operate its part of the international power plant. The chosen instrument will then have to obtain a license from the United States Power Commission, which involves public hearings at which all interested parties must be given an opportunity to air their views—a process which contains the ingredients of renewed filibuster by the antiseaway forces.

Next, whatever agency in the United States may be made responsible for power development, and the government of Ontario on the Canadian side, must secure permission from the International Joint Commission which controls all boundary waters—a body composed equally of United States and Canadian representatives—to proceed. And the Commission itself must approve the Canadian program to complete the navigation facilities in border waters, as well as secure the future rights of the shipping of the United States, not merely through the international zone but all the way to the sea. Under the Treaty of Washington, signed in 1871, the right to ascend and descend the St. Lawrence to the open sea was guaranteed in perpetuity to citizens of the United States. Thus the all-Canadian ship channel must be as free to vessels of United States registry as it is to those of Canada.

What must be said in closing, is that if the normal delays of international intercourse should be extended by blockaders, the outcome will not be an improvement in the relationship of the two peoples. The question would then arise in Canada as to whether a neighbor who is a partner in 48 miles of the St. Lawrence has a right to impede development of the whole, to Canada's economic detriment. At this writing Canada is still pinning its faith on the good-neighbor policy to expedite action in Washington to release Canada to complete a communications system that is vital to her national growth.

EXHIBIT 2

CANADA ISN'T BLUFFING ABOUT SEAWAY

(By G. V. Ferguson)

MONTREAL.—If Canadian Prime Minister Louis St. Laurent is bluffing when he says Canada is fully prepared to build the 27-foot-deep St. Lawrence waterway alone, he is wasting his talents and should devote himself full-time to poker.

Alternatively, the Canadian Parliament would have to be composed of unusually credulous men and women. For neither in the elected House of Commons nor the appointed Senate was any doubt expressed as to the genuineness of the government's proposal to set up a St. Lawrence Seaway Authority.

Even members from the Atlantic provinces, many of whom have forebodings over the economic effect of the seaway on their region, assumed that the government meant just what it said. That's what evoked demands for special consideration for the maritimes in such matters as shipbuilding and the development of the maritime steel industry.

The critics finally subsided into grumbling acquiescence. The legislation passed Parliament last month without formal opposition. Canada now stands committed to an expenditure—if necessary—of $300,000,000 to build the St. Lawrence seaway.

That 300 million has strings attached, but few Canadians doubt that they will have to put up the money. The strings are these: The legislation still leaves the door open for United States participation in a joint undertaking. Canada would prefer a partnership. There will therefore be a waiting period—assumed to be no longer than this spring—during which the United States Congress may approve the 1941 agreement.

If it does not, the Canadian Government is now in a position to set up an authority to build the navigation works on the St. Lawrence. The potential $300,000,000 bill worries no one.

This figure needs explanation. The development is often referred to as a near-billion dollar affair. That is because both navigation and power are taken into account, and the navigation phase includes works on the upper lakes which are omitted from an all-Canadian scheme.

Translated into terms of likely 1952 prices, total cost of the project, as envisaged in the 1941 agreement, might work out at $775,000,000. Of this total, the United States would pay five hundred and thirty-two million and Canada two hundred and forty-two million. Our smaller share is because, between 1918 and 1932, Canada spent $132,000,000 on the Welland Canal, which bypasses Niagara Falls between Lakes Erie and Ontario. Corresponding expenditures by the United States in improved navigation (mostly at the Soo) amounted to thirty-two million.

In arriving at the cost of the all-Canadian scheme, the first step is to lop off nearly $100,000,000 representing works on the upper lake channels which, under the agreement, were to be entrusted to the United States, and also in the Thousand Islands section of the St. Lawrence. These sections do not present a serious bottleneck. The real bottleneck is within the 115-mile stretch of lake and river between Montreal

and Ogdensburg, N. Y. It may be reduced still more to a distance of 47 miles, lying between the New York towns of St. Regis and Ogdensburg.

The key points on the Canadian side are Montreal, Cornwall (at the foot of the international rapids section) and Prescott, opposite Ogdensburg. There already exists on the Canadian side of the river a series of canals with a depth of 14 feet. They were built when Canada was in its infancy and their construction presented far greater engineering problems than does today's assignment of enlarging a 14-foot passage to 27 feet.

The joint American-Canadian undertaking would route the 27-foot channel on the American side of the international rapids section, simply because that would be less expensive. Under the all-Canadian scheme, the waterway is automatically thrown across to the Canadian side. The construction bill is swelled by nearly $38,000,000 (at today's costs) as a result.

In other respects the project, both as to navigation and power, would be much the same as under the 1941 joint plan. True, it omits those works assigned entirely to the United States; but the expectation in Canada is that once the principal bottlenecks to the seaway are removed, the United States will want to carry out the rest of the work on its own initiative.

In any event, power will bear a heavy share of the total cost. Canada and the United States will share equally 2,200,000 horsepower to be developed in the international rapids section. The province of Ontario has already reached an agreement with Ottawa on division of costs between power and navigation. It now remains, assuming that the original joint American-Canada plan falls by the wayside, for an American power authority (still to be designated) to make a similar deal for New York's share of this hydroelectric energy.

The new legislation provides for appointment of a Canadian authority to have charge of construction, maintenance, and operation of the seaway between Montreal and Lake Erie. It could establish tolls for shipping using the new 27-foot waterway. Thus the intention is to make the navigation project self-liquidating.

What it all adds up to is this: Canada is prepared to spend $300,000,000 (barring further inflation, this is an outside estimate) on clearing the navigation bottleneck on the St. Lawrence above Montreal and in a relatively minor dredging job along the Welland Canal to bring that section to a uniform depth of 27 feet.

This article takes no account of the one other major job—the bypassing of the Lachine Rapids 5 miles from Montreal Harbor. This is a purely Canadian job which will also generate great amounts of power. But a 14-foot canal already exists there. If the power is not immediately needed, the existing canal can be rebuilt and deepened.

Will there be enough traffic to pay the bill? Only experience will tell, but Canadian authorities believe that the volume of freight now carried—about 10,000,000 tons annually—will be at least quadrupled when the deeper canals are completed. Iron ore from Labrador might provide 20,000,000 tons a year of new business, and existing industries could be counted on to supply millions of additional tons once deep-draught vessels are able to go up and down the river.

REPEAL OF EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES—MOTION TO RECOMMIT

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER'S address,

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

Mr. LANGER. I yield to the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. I move that Senate bill 2104, to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended, be recommitted for further study to the Banking and Currency Committee, and reported back to the Senate not later than February 4, 1952.

Mr. President, if the Senator from North Dakota will yield to me for a minute further, I should like to state my reasons for making the motion I have just made.

Mr. LANGER. I am delighted to yield to my friend the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. CAPEHART. The committee held hearings on this particular subject some 3 months ago. Since that time, conditions may or may not have changed. However, we know that a year ago cottonseed oil was selling for approximately 25 cents a pound, whereas today it is selling for 12 cents a pound; corn oil a year ago was selling for 25 cents a pound, but today it is selling for 13 cents a pound; soybean oil a year ago was selling for 21 cents a pound, but today it is selling for 10.75 cents a pound; peanut oil a year ago was selling for 25½ cents a pound, but today it is selling for 15 cents a pound; coconut oil a year ago was selling for 19¼ cents a pound, but today it is selling for 10½ cents a pound; lard a year ago was selling for 19.15 cents a pound, but today it is selling for 14½ cents a pound; tallow a year ago was selling for 17½ cents a pound, but today it is selling for 7 cents a pound.

Mr. President, I am not saying that the pending bill should or should not be passed. All I am saying is that in this country fats and oils are depressed at the moment. I am saying that I believe the committee acted upon this matter, as far back as 4 months ago, that conditions since that time have changed, and that I sincerely believe the Senate Banking and Currency Committee ought to hold hearings and call before it the Secretary of Agriculture and other witnesses—expert witnesses—to go into the question of what is depressing the price of fats and oils in the United States, and to determine whether section 104 of the present law has had any effect on it, either pro or con. We ought to study the subject sincerely and objectively, and then report back to the Senate our findings based upon current conditions, not based upon what the conditions were some 4 months ago, or what happened at that time. Those are my reasons for making this motion to recommit the bill.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

Mr. LANGER. Wait a moment. I did not yield for that purpose.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Dakota has the floor at this time.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Chair said the question was on the motion, thus calling for a vote.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota yielded to me, and I made the motion to recommit. That was all I did. The motion, of course, is the pending question, but the Senator from North Dakota has the floor; and until he finishes, of course, no action can be taken on the motion.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is so advised.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the motion and the remarks made thereon by the distinguished Senator from Indiana appear at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

During the delivery of Mr. LANGER'S speech,

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, will the distinguished Senator yield for an announcement?

Mr. LANGER. I am very happy to yield to the majority leader.

Mr. McFARLAND. I ask unanimous consent that the announcement appear after the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, I have been asked by quite a number of Senators what the program of the Senate is to be. I am endeavoring to work out an agreement as to a time to vote on the pending measure. We had hoped that we could temporarily lay aside the unfinished business and consider and dispose of tomorrow the bills providing for the temporary repeal of the import duties on lead and zinc. It now develops that there is more opposition to the bills than we had previously anticipated, and they may take longer than 1 day. Under those circumstances, we do not feel that we would be justified in temporarily laying aside the unfinished business for that length of time.

Quite a number of Senators had made plans with the expectation that those bills would be considered tomorrow. Some Senators have indicated that they wanted to attend the funeral of Hon. Robert P. Patterson, which is to be tomorrow afternoon. Under the circumstances, I think it is advisable that the Senate go over until Monday. I do not want Senators to think that this is a precedent for recessing over every Friday. The circumstances, however, which have developed have made it desirable in this instance.

Senators who are interested in the pending measure have indicated that on Monday we may be able to arrive at a unanimous consent agreement to vote at an early time thereafter.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Can the Senator tell us about when we are to vote on the motion of the distinguished Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to recommit the bill?

Mr. McFARLAND. Not unless we can come to a unanimous-consent agreement. I thought we would endeavor to ascertain what we could do in that direction.

Mr. LANGER. At any rate, it will not be this afternoon?

Mr. McFARLAND. It will not be this afternoon.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President——

Mr. McFARLAND. I may say to my distinguished friend that I tried to get a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on the bill. Senators told me that they would object to a vote tomorrow. I tried to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Monday. I was told that certain Senators would object to a vote on Monday. I tried to obtain a unanimous-consent agreement to vote on Tuesday, and was told that there would be objection to a vote on Tuesday. The earliest possibility that I can see is Wednesday. I am hopeful that on Monday perhaps we can obtain an agreement to vote at a little earlier time. For that reason I think we should go over until Monday.

Mr. LANGER. Knowing the distinguished Senator from Arizona and the eloquence he possesses, together with the number of plans he has to make obstinate Senators change their minds, I am sure that he will be successful in arranging an early time to vote.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. McFARLAND. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I should like to ask how this bill happens to be before the Senate for consideration at this time, anyway. It deals purely with a tariff matter, as I understand. I believe that under the Constitution, matters of this kind must originate in the House. I wonder how the bill happens to be before the Senate. Who is in such a hurry that we must disregard the Constitution, the rules of the Senate, the rules of the House, and all other rules? Why is there such a big hurry?

Mr. McFARLAND. I am not going to take the time of the distinguished Senator from Nevada to answer that question.

Mr. MALONE. I shall be glad to yield all the time necessary.

Mr. McFARLAND. I will let that question be debated when the question comes before the Senate, and discussion is not proceeding on other matters. I am sure that the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] would be very happy to answer that question in his own time.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I should like to ask the majority leader a question. As I understand, in view of the objection of the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. McCARRAN], the bills affecting zinc and lead in the same manner as the pending bill affects farm products will not come before the Senate on Monday.

Mr. McFARLAND. Those who are in charge of the pending legislation want to finish the pending bill before considering those bills. I give notice now that we intend to follow that plan, unless there is a change in the plans, in which event I shall announce it. We will not take up those bills until we finish the pending bill.

Mr. MALONE. The zinc and lead bills affect the tariffs on metals in the same manner that the pending bill affects the protection to farm products. As I understand, those bills will not come before the Senate on Monday.

Mr. McFARLAND. They will not come before the Senate on Monday.

REPEAL OF EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

THD ADMINISTRATION'S FREE TRADE PROGRAM

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I have on several occasions taken the floor to urge that Congress retain in its own hands firm control over international commerce and international trade as the Constitution provides.

We have failed to do that, and today we are faced with a situation in which foreign nations are telling us what we can do and what we cannot do to regulate imports into our own country.

We find ourselves dividing our markets with the nations of the world and exporting jobs and investments.

EXPORT JOBS AND INVESTMENTS

Foreign nations are demanding the right to ship into this country imports of dairy products at such destructive levels that the domestic source of supply of these essential foods would be imperiled in time of great international emergency, at the expense of our own workingmen and investors.

CONGRESS SHOULD REASSERT ITS POWER

The time has come for Congress to reassert its power as one of the three independent branches of our Government set up by the Constitution as a check on the executive and judicial branches, and for it to resume its constitutional authority to regulate commerce, to approve treaties with foreign nations, to regulate the coinage of money, and generally to discharge its responsibilities as defined in the Constitution of the United States.

The power to regulate foreign commerce is vested in Congress because Congress is the representative of the people. By the same token the responsibility for the impact of foreign products upon the American farmer, the American worker, and American industry, rests squarely upon the shoulders of the Congress, the legislative branch of the Government.

THE PEOPLE'S RIGHT

Mr. President, the people have a right to expect us, their elected representatives, to assume this responsibility, and to exercise the powers given us, without delegating them to the executive branch. The workingmen and the farmers of this Nation have a right to expect us to provide reasonable safeguards against imports produced in countries where labor is cheap and where standards of living are low.

FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

Mr. President, world trade must be developed on a basis of fair and reasonable competition. It must be done within the principle that foreign products of underpaid foreign labor shall not be admitted to this country on terms which endanger the living standards of the American workingman or the American farmer, or threaten serious injury to a domestic industry.

SMALL STEP IN RECOGNITION OF PRINCIPLE

The controls provided under section 104 of the Defense Production Act are a step in the direction of recognition of principle of protection. They recognize the necessity of protection of the American workingman and the American farmer from products produced by the sweatshop labor of Europe and Asia.

They provide only the minimum protection necessary to prevent injury to the American dairy industry. They are designed to permit imports up to the point of impairment of our domestic source of supply of the fats and oils essential in both peace and war.

SHOULD NOT IMPAIR INDUSTRY

Mr. President, it would be most unwise in the present emergency to permit our domestic source of supply of milk and dairy products to be impaired through the repeal of section 104, and to now depend on foreign imports for such essential items.

CONTINUAL EMERGENCY

Mr. President, we hardly know from one day to the next when full-scale war may develop and foreign sources of supply may be cut off. We have the police action in Korea, started by the President of the United States, and a continual scarehead from the Executive that whatever move we may make may result in full-scale war. The conduct of that war, in the opinion of the junior Senator from Nevada, is a disgrace to the people of the United States of America. Nevertheless, it is a continuing threat. If continued along the lines it is now being conducted it may develop into a full-scale war. We should not put these commodities in the same position as tin, rubber, and other strategic and critical minerals and materials—dependent upon foreign sources.

PROTECT OUR TAXPAYERS

It is equally essential to the national security that our system of storing dairy products during the season of flush production be protected against unlimited and uncontrolled imports. In other words, it makes little sense to buy the butter and other agricultural products of our own producers and store them in warehouses, while allowing unlimited imports for consumption in the United States and charging the whole thing up to the taxpayers of this country.

It is utter idiocy, but apparently we have adopted that policy.

Section 104 authorizes import controls on butter, cheese, and certain other products whenever imports would otherwise come in at such a rate as to reduce domestic production below safe levels, increase the necessity of storing of dairy products, and result in unnecessary expenditures under price-support programs.

Unless imports would result in harm to these industries, as measured by these standards, no controls may be applied under this section. It is a very mild provision at best, and a minimum of protection.

SECTION 104 SIMPLY A STOP-GAP

Section 104 is simply a stop-gap pending the adoption by Congress of the principle of fair and reasonable competition as a criterion of foreign imports, and is flexible in that it is required that the import level be adjusted from time to time either upward or downward as the supply situation changes to permit the maximum level of imports that will not cause injury.

It is a stop-gap until the principle of fair and reasonable competitive controls can be applied. No foreign nation and no other commodity group has any right to ask the dairy farmers of this Nation to take imports in excess of these levels, or under the fair and reasonable competitive price.

INJURY WOULD RESULT

The Secretary of Agriculture has determined that imports in excess of the levels authorized under section 104 would cause injury as measured by the standards set up in the act.

A DISCREDITED SECRETARY OF STATE

The State Department has told us, in effect, that we cannot now prevent destructive imports into this country under section 104 because our rights to do so has been contracted away in GATT, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade. It is that great international agreement, which was cooked up by a thoroughly discredited State Department, and which has never been submitted to the Congress of the United States.

RESPONSIBILITY VESTED IN CONGRESS

As I have stated, the responsibility to regulate foreign commerce is vested in Congress by the Constitution. Although Congress delegated to the President power to negotiate tariff rates, there is a serious question as to whether it has ever delegated power to enter into international agreements which would prohibit the Congress itself from protecting the American people against harmful imports.

Mr. President, there is also a serious question as to the constitutional authority for Congress, under a clear mandate of the Constitution to regulate foreign trade, to delegate such authority to the executive branch of the Government.

GATT NEVER SUBMITTED TO CONGRESS

Mr. President, the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade has never been submitted to Congress for approval. On numerous occasions Congress has taken action in connection with other legislation to guard against approval of the agreement.

THE ITO

A charter for the International Trade Organization, which embodied the same principle as the General Agreement on Tariff and Trade was submitted to Congress for approval, but it was never approved. I will say it was never pressed by the State Department. They were afraid to press it, because even a subservient Congress of the United States had more gumption than to adopt anything like that. I say "even the Congress of the United States," because it has taken about everything else the Executive has offered, Mr. President.

FOREIGN COUNTRIES BLACKMAIL US

In view of the foregoing I am not inclined to give much weight to the argument that our hands have been tied by the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade and that we are now powerless to perform the duties vested in us and charged to us by the Constitution. Neither am I impressed with the arguments of foreign countries that section 104 is a violation of the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and that unless we permit them to bring in dairy products at destructive levels they will retaliate against us. It is a clear case of blackmail.

Mr. President, they have continually discriminated against us. It is not retaliation; it is discrimination. They have never changed.

AXIOMATIC NATIONS DO NOT BUY WHAT THEY CAN PRODUCE

Mr. President, no nation or individual—and this is the criterion by which to measure legitimate foreign trade—ever purchases anything from another nation or individual which it or he cannot conveniently produce.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. MALONE. I am very happy to yield for a question.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I believe it would be well to ask the Senator from Nevada if he is familiar with the countries that have placed restrictions on our imports. I do not know the names of the 10 countries which it is charged are opposed to section 104. At any rate, the following countries have placed restrictions on our exports: The Netherlands, Denmark, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Australia, France, and Finland. The nature of the restrictions is in the form of balance dollar payments. These countries make findings as to the volume of dollar payments available for imports from the United States. When such volume of dollar payments has been exhausted they say no further imports shall come in. In effect it is the same type of restriction we are attempting to provide here, except that we are doing it, I believe, on a much more justifiable and equitable basis, because we are supporting with taxpayers' money the programs which might be injured.

CONGRESS AWAKENING

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I am very happy that the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON] has interrupted me to read that statement, because it shows an awakening on the part of Congress as to exactly what is happening and what has been happening throughout the 19 years of the supervision of foreign trade by the State Department. Foreign countries have continually kept exports from our country out of their country.

DOLLAR BALANCE

They say that when they reach the end of their dollar balance they cannot import more goods. All we do in that case is pass another bond issue, raise the taxes, or both, and pick up the check. That is the difference. It shows a very great amount of common sense on their part, but little on ours.

They have always operated in that fashion. We always did take care of our workers until 1933 or 1934, when we passed the so-called Reciprocal Trade Agreement Act.

NOT A RECIPROCAL TRADE ACT

The phrase "reciprocal trade" does not appear in the act. It is not reciprocal, and was never intended to be reciprocal. It is a catch phrase to sell free trade to the American people. It is finally catching up with us.

DOLLAR PAYMENTS—DOLLAR SHORTAGE

Mr. President, there has never been a greater hoax perpetrated on the American people than by what is called a dollar shortage. What is a dollar shortage? It is when a foreign country puts a price in dollars on its money—on the pound, for example—in dollars which is greater than the free market price in dollars. No one will pay the fictitious price, so a dollar shortage exists.

Suppose today the Congress passed an act to the effect that the British pound was worth one dollar and no more could be paid for it. Then we would have a shortage of pounds. Of course it is utter idiocy but the phrase has been sold to the American people, during the last 19 years, and it is part of the Fabian-Marxist-Socialist program.

SECTION 104 DOES NOT VIOLATE GATT IN ANY CASE

In the first place, Mr. President, section 104 falls clearly within an exception to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade, and there is no foundation for the argument that the Agreement has been violated. Although quotas in general are forbidden by the Agreement, an exception is provided for such action as that taken by Congress under section 104.

That arrangement prevents our thoroughly discredited Secretary of State from trading down the river any United States industry that he may wish to trade for some fancied advantage—for instance, when he threatened to withdraw from Austria certain trade advantages because Austria had imprisoned some Americans. In short, the Secretary of State was attempting to trade for some fancied advantage the livelihood of the American workers in the affected industries.

THE AGREEMENT EXCEPTION

Mr. President, article XXI of the Agreement contains the following exception:

> Nothing in this Agreement shall be construed * * * to prevent any contracting party from taking any action which it considers necessary for the protection of its essential security interests * * * taken in time of war or other emergency in international relations * * *.

Mr. President, it cannot be denied that we are in the midst of one of the most serious emergencies in international relations that this country has ever faced. Its seriousness arises because of the way in which it is being handled by the administration.

In such emergencies, the Agreement does not prevent a country from taking any action deemed by it necessary for its own security. The Agreement prescribes no limit to the kind of action

which can be taken, and leaves it entirely to the country involved to determine what action is necessary for its own protection.

In passing section 104, Congress has determined that the impairment of our domestic source of supply of essential commodities and the impairment of our economic strength by unnecessary Government expenditures under price-support programs would be contrary to the security interests of the United States in the present emergency. These are entirely reasonable and logical findings, well supported by the facts; and no foreign nation has any right to challenge our judgment in that respect—least of all, Mr. President, the foreign nations which have protested in this case. Practically all foreign nations have protected their own commerce from the beginning, and have dealt with an irresponsible United States Secretary of State in an endeavor to divide the markets of this country among themselves, but to give us nothing in return.

TAXPAYERS PAY FOR FOREIGN TRADE INCREASE

Mr. President, if it is necessary for us to go into detail in these matters, I shall be glad to do so and I shall be glad to debate them with any Members of the Senate. It can be shown that any increase which has occurred in our foreign trade has come about only by means of the money we have given to the other countries, to enable them to buy our products, and from purchases by the United States Armed Forces and other extraordinary purchases. If we should do away with such gifts of money tomorrow we should likewise lose any increase in foreign trade which we have ever had in the last 19 years.

FOREIGN NATIONS PROTECT THEMSELVES

The foreign nations have gumption enough to protect themselves, although apparently that instinct is something that we in the United States have not yet developed. We did have it for 75 years, but then we abandoned the principle of developing foreign trade on the fair and reasonable competitive basis. Mr. President, it is time that we developed a little common sense on the floor of the Senate, in regard to foreign trade. The people of the country are years ahead of Congress in their thinking.

NINE NATIONS CHALLENGED OUR RIGHT TO PROTECT OURSELVES

Nine nations have challenged our right to use an exception in the trade agreement to protect essential food supplies in the face of impending war. Those nations are the Netherlands, Denmark, Italy, New Zealand, Norway, Australia, France, Canada, and Finland. Mr. President, every one of those nations has in the past used an exception in the trade agreement to protect its own industries against American exports; and out of the nine nations, eight of them are still doing so.

MANIPULATION OF CURRENCY FOR TRADE ADVANTAGE

As a matter of fact, Mr. President, they go farther than that; all of them manipulate their currency for trade advantage with the exception of Canada at this time, which has just abolished such controls. Of course, a manipulation of the currency for trade advantage is a form of piracy.

FORMS OF PIRACY

Mr. President, there are three forms of piracy. One was practiced 100 to 150 years ago on the high seas, when merchant ships were captured and were towed into port, and were held to belong to the person capturing them.

The second form of piracy occurred in connection with the so-called reciprocal trade agreements, dividing our markets and tending to bring the United States standard of living down to a level with the standards of living of the other countries of the world.

The third form of piracy, of course, occurs in connection with the matter of unlimited appropriations in exported cash to make up the trade balances of the foreign nations each year until such time as it is possible to divide our markets among them so that, theoretically, there will be no trade-balance deficit.

The result, of course, will be a gradual lowering of the American standard of living. We now hold our standard of living through additional bond issues and tax increases in order to "pick up the check"; but when we stop that practice, our standard of living will decline.

FOREIGN POLICY WRONG

Mr. President, we have not tried to force American exports into other countries at ruinous levels. We do not now take kindly to their demand that unless we permit a destructive level of imports of their products, they will retaliate. Certainly there is something seriously wrong with this kind of foreign policy.

NINETEEN-YEAR-OLD POLICY

Mr. President, we have had a 19-year-old pattern of Fabian-Marxist socialism to which this country has been subjected.

BITE THE HAND THAT FEEDS THEM

Furthermore, most of the countries which are protesting our use of section 104 are on the United States payroll in one form or another, either directly or indirectly; and most of those nations are complaining about any reduction in the assistance we give them. However, now they are threatening to bite the hand that feeds them, unless we permit them to impair the American dairy industry.

Mr. President, let me say that the threatened impairment is not to the dairy industry alone, but to every other industry in the United States of America.

Those countries are hardly in a position to be too arbitrary in their retaliation.

SUE US FOR NONSUPPORT

Mr. President, we have been giving them this money now through lend-lease, UNRRA, a direct loan to England of $3,750,000,000, the Marshall plan, ECA, and point 4, whatever it is called.

We change the designation often enough to fool our own people. It has only amounted to one thing, and that is to make up these trade-balance deficits until such time as we can divide our markets with them and average our standard of living. The Congress has been giving this money to the foreign countries in habit-forming quantities now for many years.

We are now practically threatened with a suit for nonsupport if we quit paying them or cut down the amount. They are likely to sue us in the International Court of the Hague if we cut down on the amount of money which we have given them the right to expect, to support their standard of living and in the style to which they would like to become accustomed.

THE GATT

Mr. President, 34 nations are parties to the general agreement respecting trade and tariff. Twenty-three of them are currently restricting imports under an exception in the agreement, and practically all of them have in the past years an exception for that purpose; and every last one of them has these quotas, restrictions, manipulations of currency for trade advantage, and every other known trick of the trade by which to take advantage of an agreement, once it is made.

Mr. President, I would point out that these are not trade agreements. There is no provision for trade agreements. There are provisions for agreements to lower tariffs, and there are a hundred different ways of escaping from the effect of a lower tariff—and they use all of them. Mr. President, the controls provided by section 104 are beyond the fair and reasonable competition principle; and they afford no sound justification for any nation to retaliate or to hold any ill will against the United States. This is as good a time as any to put our foot down on that sort of talk. If any retaliation results over the use of such reasonable controls as these, it ought to be thoroughly and vigorously investigated and dealt with.

SECTION 104 DOES NOT PROHIBIT IMPORTS

Now, Mr. President, I point out that the standards for import controls in connection with dairy products, authorized by section 104, any statement to the contrary notwithstanding, do not prohibit imports on dairy products. Section 104 provides that imports may be regulated, and if the Secretary of Agriculture finds that imports would (a) impair our domestic source of supply, (b) disrupt the storing or marketing system during a season of fresh production, (c) result in unnecessary expenditures under the price-support program. Unless one of the three results named above would result in a situation in which imports cannot be controlled under section 104.

SECTION 104 NOT THE ANSWER, BUT IS A STOPGAP

Now, Mr. President, I want to point out that the junior Senator from Nevada is defending section 104 as a mild attempt to cure what a 19-year-old program by the State Department, under the 1934 Trade Agreements Act, transferring from the Congress of the United States authority to regulate foreign commerce, has brought about.

BRAKE ON AN IRRESPONSIBLE SECRETARY OF STATE

It is not the answer, it does not even approach the answer: It is simply a brake on an irresponsible, reckless Secretary of State who uses that act for the purpose of trading the jobs and the investments of the United States of America, the workingman and the investor alike, for some fancied advantage in another field; and, of course, it should be repealed. It should never have been extended even the first time, and passed for a 3-year period; and every subsequent 3-year period since that time, since 1934, has been extended. It now comes before the Senate of the United States, in February 1953, for extension, and if the Congress of the United States does not extend them, we are through with it and it should not be extended, it should be beaten and in its place, Mr. President, a policy should be laid down by the Congress of the United States that foreign trade should be promoted on a basis of fair and reasonable competition and a flexible import fee should be used by the Tariff Commission, putting the full responsibility on the Tariff Commission to determine what that fair and reasonable competition may be.

FAIR AND REASONABLE COMPETITION

No dairy farmer, miner, textile manufacturer, crockery manufacturer, or anyone else of the hundreds of industries in this country—no investor or workingman will object to destructive foreign imports if basis of fair and reasonable competition is adopted.

How can that be done? Let the Tariff Commission have full authority to determine what that fair and reasonable competition is, and let them fix the tariff on a basis of a flexible tariff to make up that differential, which is roughly the difference between the wage standard of living in this country and abroad. Some folks say, "You cannot determine what foreign costs are." That is unnecessary. It is only necessary, I would point out to the Senate of the United States, to take the declared customs value or the offer-for-sale price in this country for the foreign costs; and I guarantee to the Senate of the United States that it will have more information, that is, the Tariff Commission will have more information piled upon its desks within 30 days than it can assimilate.

Let the Tariff Commission determine what the amount or the tariff should be, in order to make up that differential of cost between the wage living standard of the American workingman and the American farmer, and the wages and costs abroad. And it should be done on a basis of principle, and they should then let it alone. Charge the Tariff Commission with the duty of fixing its flexible import fee on that basis, a basis of fair and reasonable competition; and when they are not following that principle, bring them before a Senate committee. That would be analogous to the method used by Congress in the matter of fixing freight rates. We are all familiar with the fact that many years ago before we had an Interstate Commerce Commission every railroad had a separate rate, and generally a different rate for every important shipper. So the Congress of the United States laid down a principle. What was that principle? It was the principle of a reasonable return on the investment. When it created the Interstate Commerce Commission, it charged the Commission with the responsibility of fixing freight rates on a basis of a reasonable return on investment. Many factors enter into the determination of what a reasonable return on an investment should be but they adhered to the principle.

The junior Senator from Nevada served 8½ years on the public service commission of his State, and he has often held hearings for the Interstate Commerce Commission in that connection.

CONGRESS SHOULD FIX THE PRINCIPLE

That is what the junior Senator from Nevada means by laying down a principle of fixing tariffs to make up the differential of cost between a domestic and a foreign-produced article on the basis of a fair and reasonable competition.

Mr. President, under that principle, we would not then divide our markets with foreign nations. The markets of the United States could not be divided among the foreign nations, and we would abandon the idea of a division of the wealth of the nations of the world to bring about a one economic world.

Karl Marx had that idea 100 years ago when he said he was for free trade, not for itself, but because the adopted principle hastened the revolution.

On that same basis, he was also for an unlimited income tax.

He is now being proved correct on both counts. Certainly it will hasten a revolution of the taxpayers of the United States.

So, in closing, Mr. President, I say it is time Congress reassessed the whole foreign-trade program and laid down a principle to be followed to protect the economic structure of this Nation and the livelihood of the workmen, farmers, and of the investors of this Nation.

NOTICE OF MOTION TO CONSIDER BILL DISSOLVING THE RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION

During the delivery of Mr. MALONE'S speech,

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, will the Senator from Nevada yield to me at this point for half a minute?

Mr. MALONE. I am glad to do so.

Mr. CAPEHART. I simply wish to go on record at this time so that other Senators may be informed that before we act on the question of confirming the nomination of a new Director for the RFC, I shall move that the Senate consider Senate bill 1376, Calendar No. 520, a bill introduced by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. BYRD], for himself and other Senators, and calling for the dissolution of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and the transfer of certain functions related to the national defense heretofore vested in the Reconstruction Finance Corporation.

In other words, I simply want the Senate to know that I shall move to have that bill considered before any action is taken on the question of confirming the appointment of a new one-man Director for the RFC.

Mr. MALONE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the remarks of the Senator from Indiana, interrupting my remarks, appear in the RECORD at the end of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ROBERT P. PATTERSON

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, the tragic death of Robert P. Patterson was a great shock to the thousands who knew him and loved him. His passing is a great loss to the people of the United States. He was a man of ability. Indeed, his ability was exceeded only by his integrity and sterling character.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks an editorial published in the New York Herald Tribune of today, and also an editorial from the Baltimore Sun of today, dedicated to his life and services.

There being no objection, the editorials were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of January 24, 1952]

ROBERT P. PATTERSON

Many in the past hours have wished to pay tribute to Robert P. Patterson; and through the kind of things that have been said, and the kind of people who have said them, there emerges a sharp picture of a man—a man of intelligence, ability, and courage. He was a man of complete integrity, of charm, and of toughness, who was willing to give his high qualities without stint to the public service, and when he had returned to private life, to those various public causes which seemed to him of vital national and human significance.

He was an outstanding exemplar of a type of public officer which, if not exactly new in our history, emerged with a new importance in the great crisis of the Second World War. Often from modest backgrounds, their initial training was neither in government nor in politics but as lawyers, bankers, or businessmen, in the climate of competitive enterprise. Like Patterson, however, most of them had given service, and often combat service, to their country as young men during the First World War; they were touched with the soldier's ideal of duty as well as the citizen's ideal of freedom and initiative. They had their politics, but theirs was never a politican's attitude toward either the rewards or the obligations of high office. It was Roosevelt's move in 1940 to broaden his administration against the impending storms by appointing Stimson and Knox to his Cabinet, which brought many of them into the public service. Patterson was drafted from the Federal bench to become Stimson's Under Secretary of War at about the time that Forrestal was drafted for the equivalent post in the Navy; the two men were unlike in personality, but their two careers ran thereafter in close parallel in the posts they held, the devotion they gave to them and the achievements they accomplished in the Nation's behalf.

Patterson munitioned the Army as Forrestal munitioned the Navy. As the last Secretary of War, Patterson hammered out with Forrestal the problems of unification; the two men's ideas differed, but the result

was a joint work, and Patterson might well have been first Secretary of Defense had he not preferred to return to private life. But there he could never regard private practice as any discharge from his public responsibilities. Rugged, colorful, brave, and high-minded, he still had much to give to his country when his career was cut suddenly short in the blazing airplane wreck in Elizabeth. The loss is tragic, and all the more so because one does not know how many like him we may be breeding today. We desperately need men of his character, background, outlook, and capacity if we are to manage the staggering governmental machinery which we insist on building; one wishes that it were possible to feel greater confidence that we shall get them.

[From the Baltimore Sun of January 24, 1952]

ROBERT P. PATTERSON

One of the pleasant Army events of 1940, when pleasant events were almost as rare as they are today, was the manner in which Robert P. Patterson learned that he was selected as Assistant Secretary of War.

Two decades earlier he had served as a major of infantry in World War I (gathering both a Distinguished Service Cross and a Silver Star for gallantry, and also a Purple Heart) and he had later become a distinguished occupant of the Federal bench.

But in mid-1940 he and numerous other durable veterans were taking what the Army calls a refresher course in anticipation of another stint in combat. When the summons to Washington came to the Army camp, Judge Patterson was engaged in humble "kitchen-police" duty, from which the Secretary's office, as any soldier will tell you, is quite a bound. He made that first bound, and quickly moved on to be Under Secretary, where for nearly 5 years he was one of the truly great factors in preparing the sinews of war for American soldiers in the greatest of world conflicts.

Then he became Secretary, following his old chief, Henry L. Stimson, and then, with postwar policies determined, went back as plain citizen to his very successful law practice.

But at frequent intervals he emerged from private life to battle effectively and inspiringly for a strong defense establishment, for universal military training, for full American cooperation in international duties, and for a general exercise of obligations which he felt every citizen owes his country and community. Therein he continued to demonstrate two of the outstanding qualities which made him so admirable a citizen: his compelling sense of duty, and his confidence that it was shared by all his fellows.

For all his bluntness of utterance, his was a sunny nature. He trusted others and, such is man's nature, others responded to that trust. Because he expected others to do their best without wavering and without compromise, they generally did, for they could not let the judge down.

His confidence was not often misplaced, because his own example in industry and integrity and selflessness and devotion was itself an abiding inspiration. He asked no one else to do quite as much as he himself did daily, in as long a working day as officialdom often sees. That is a noble quality, and a memorable one, in a citizen as in a statesman. His Baltimore marriage and frequent visits gave us a sort of neighborly relationship to him, and a special pride.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with those who have spoken concerning the remarkable career of the late Robert P. Patterson. When he was Secretary of War, in my opinion he did more than any other man in the United States to bring about friendly relations with the people of Germany. When that war was over and the people of Germany and Austria were starving, he appeared personally before the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service and begged the committee to get the Postmaster General to permit the shipment of packages to individuals among our late enemies who were suffering in Austria and Germany.

As a result of his fine work, in the month of October more than 41,000,000 pounds of food packages and clothing were sent to Austria and Germany. Time and again he intervened before our committee, speaking in behalf of those people. With his passing the people of Austria and Germany, in my opinion, have lost one of their very best friends in this country, and they mourn his untimely passing.

He was my great friend. I was associated with him upon many occasions. I particularly remember one occasion when we were at the baseball park together. He took nearly half an hour to explain to me the work which he had done in order to do away with race and religious prejudice, in order to make our country one great, united America. He was a great patriot.

REPEAL OF EMBARGO ON IMPORTATION OF CERTAIN COMMODITIES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2104) to repeal section 104 of the Defense Production Act of 1950, as amended.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, inasmuch as I shall have a great deal to say about this question, and inasmuch as the leadership has agreed that there will probably be no vote on the bill today, and the Senate will recess until Monday, at which time the debate will continue, particularly I believe on the motion of the Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART] to recommit the bill for further study, it may be that after conference with the majority and minority leaders they will want to recess at this time until Monday. I have attempted to get into contact with the majority leader, who is in the Policy Committee room, and we shall know within a few minutes.

I shall discuss section 104 quite specifically. I have no desire to become involved in discussions on the principle of reciprocal-trade agreements versus tariffs. I have always contended that section 104, which is a version of an amendment which I offered on many occasions and in many Congresses, is not in conflict and is not incompatible at all with the reciprocal-trade theory. I have long been a supporter of reciprocal-trade agreements, and, in all the years in which I have been in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, have supported such agreements.

It seems to me there has been a great deal of misunderstanding not only as to the import of the language of section 104, but misunderstanding as to the motives and the reasons for that section. There is certainly a great misunderstanding on the part of many persons as to whether it is in conflict with our program of reciprocal trade agreements.

I hope to discuss that question on Monday. I may take this opportunity to discuss another portion of it. The Senator from Arkansas made a point about the colloquy between myself and the senior Senator from Colorado at the time when the amendment was adopted by the Senate last fall. It is true that the RECORD itself points out that it might probably be construed as being misleading. There was certainly no intention on the part of the Senator from Washington to mislead or to misinform the Senate as to the purport of the amendment which is now known as section 104. It was read to the Senate two or three times. There was a great deal of discussion as to whether it was subject to a point of order. I think the mistake occurred, insofar as I was concerned, when the Senator from Colorado and I were discussing the extension of Public Law 590. When he asked me regarding it I had two amendments on my desk, and I said to him, "The language is the same." In the discussion, which was early in the session, I made the mistake of thinking he was referring to the extension of Public Law 590, the Second War Powers Act. In the meantime, the language of section 104 was agreed to. There was certainly no intention on my part to misinform or to mislead the Senate.

The Senator from Arkansas made much of the point that there were no hearings on the amendment. That is true. It was not brought before the committee, but it had been under discussion many, many times on the floor of the Senate. The Senator from Arkansas and I, a year and half ago, discussed the problem for almost a whole day as it relates to reciprocal-trade agreements, section 22 of the Agricultural Act, and other related statutes.

The House took up the matter and had some discussion on it and had a yea-and-nay vote. The Senator from Arkansas was asked on yesterday what the vote was in the House on section 104, the language of which was identical with the language before us, I have had my office check on it and am informed that the yea-and-nay vote on the so-called Andresen fats and oil amendment, on July 20, 1951, was 265 yeas and 148 nays. Later one Member changed his vote, after some discussion, so that the final tally was 266 to 147.

But those are matters which I hope to go into in detail on next Monday.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SPARKMAN in the chair) laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting several

nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

The following favorable report of a nomination was submitted:

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

V. Allan Hubbard, of Chaffee, Mo., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 45, with headquarters at St. Louis, Mo.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there be no further reports of committees, the clerk will state the nominations on the Executive Calendar.

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of John Thomas Schneider to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

The legislative clerk read the nomination of J. Haden Alldredge to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner.

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I wish to ask a question about this nomination. Has it been approved by the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce?

Mr. MAGNUSON. Oh, yes; it came before our committee as did the routine nominations in the Coast Guard and in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast Guard.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I ask that the Coast Guard nominations be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations in the Coast Guard are confirmed en bloc.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, I make the same request, that the nominations in the Coast and Geodetic Survey be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the nominations are confirmed en bloc. That completes the Executive Calendar.

Without objection, the President will be notified of all confirmations made today.

RECESS TO MONDAY

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. President, unless some Senator has some other business to bring before the Senate, I now move that the Senate stand in recess until Monday next at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 3 o'clock and 59 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, January 28, 1952, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate January 24 (legislative day of January 10), 1952:

INTERNATIONAL BANK FOR RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

Andrew N. Overby, of the District of Columbia, to be United States executive director of the International Bank for Reconstruction and Development, in place of William McChesney Martin, Jr.

IN THE MARINE CORPS

Maj. Gen. William P. T. Hill, United States Marine Corps, to be Quartermaster General of the Marine Corps, with the rank of major general, for a period of 2 years from February 1, 1952.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate January 24 (legislative day of January 10), 1952:

DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

John Thomas Schneider, of the District of Columbia, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce.

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION

J. Haden Alldredge, of Alabama, to be an Interstate Commerce Commissioner for the term expiring December 31, 1958.

UNITED STATES COAST GUARD

To be captains

James C. Wendland
Richard M. Ross
John A. Dirks
Harry A. Loughlin
Henry J. Wuensch

To be commanders

James E. Muzzy
Raymond W. Blouin
Kenneth W. Donnell
Owen P. Thomas
William B. Dawson
Harry E. Rowand

To be lieutenant commanders

William A. Jenkins
Charles E. Vautrain, Jr.
John Natwig
Roy M. Hutchins, Jr.

To be lieutenants

Peter S. Branson
Harrison B. Smith
John M. Dorsey
Paul A. Lutz
Robert C. Boardman
William E. Fuller, Jr.
Parker O. Chapman
William H. Brinkmeyer
George H. Weller
David A. Webb
Richard W. Goode
James L. Harrison
William E. Murphy

To be chief pay clerks

Wayne C. Wallace
Gordon White

To be chief machinists

Jesse M. Jenkins, Jr.
Ervin Frye
William J. Hill

To be chief boatswains

Lewis A. Woodaman
Harold F. Morrison
Edward L. McLean

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY

To be captains

Jack C. Sammons, effective January 1, 1952.
H. Arnold Karo, effective January 1, 1952.
George L. Anderson, effective February 1, 1952.

To be commanders

Clarence R. Reed, effective January 1, 1952.
William C. Russell, effective January 1, 1952.
Junius T. Jarman, effective January 19, 1952.
Herman C. Applequist, effective January 19, 1952.

To be lieutenant commanders

Francis X. Popper, effective January 1, 1952.
Raymond M. Stone, effective January 1, 1952.

To be lieutenant (junior grade)

Steven L. Hollis, Jr., effective January 26, 1952.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

THURSDAY, JANUARY 24, 1952

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Chaplain John H. Craven, lieutenant commander, United States Navy, offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, our Heavenly Father, we invoke Thy blessings upon this assembly and its deliberations this day. Grant Thy wisdom to these men in their important work.

Help us to remember our servicemen who today by land, sea, or air engage in the battle for righteousness against tyranny, in the struggle for freedom against force. Uphold them in the hollow of Thy hand, and cover them with Thy sheltering wings of mercy. Carry them through the darkness, danger, and despair of their conflict to a triumph for justice and truth.

Show us our part as representatives of the people in the redemption of the world from cruelty and hate and make us faithful and courageous in the accomplishment of this holy purpose. To this end we dedicate ourselves unto Thee, the only giver of all victory. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SPECIAL ORDER GRANTED

Mr. MILLS. Mr. Speaker, I have a special order for today. I ask unanimous consent that that order be vacated and that I may have the privilege of addressing the House for 30 minutes on Tuesday next, following the legislative business of the day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON ELECTIONS

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, notwithstanding the House being in session this afternoon, the Subcommittee on Elections may be allowed to sit.

The SPEAKER. There is no business before the House today, and without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the other day I received permission to insert an article from the American Legion magazine called Truth About the Katyn Massacre. I find that it exceeds the two